

JUN 6 1958

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

deah

modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

VOL. LXXIII, NO. 5, MAY 1958

-
- 321 *Genesis* 1316. ROBERT P. CREED
- 325 Dialectal English *pie*. CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON
- 327 Impingham's Borrowings from Chaucer. R. H. BOWERS
- 329 Donne's Gold-Leaf and his Compasses. W. A. MURRAY
- 331 Herrick's "Upon Julia's Clothes." LOUIS H. LEITER
- 332 A Damsel with a Dulcimer: An Interpretation of Poe's "Eleonora."
SAM S. BASKETT
- 338 The Ethical Dimension of "The Custom House." LARZER ZIFF
- 344 The Narrator of "The Blessed Damozel." PAUL LAUTER
- 348 Fall and Winter in Frost. WILLIAM T. MOYNIHAN
- 351 Again the "Je Ne Sais Quoi." WOLFGANG E. THORMANN
- 355 The Informant and the Adverb. ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

REVIEWS

- 364 IRWIN SMITH, *Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse: A Modern Reconstruction in Text and Scale Drawings* (JOHN RUSSELL BROWN)
- 367 ANDREW HILEN, ed., *The Diary of Clara Crowninshield: A European Tour with Long-fellow, 1835-36* (WILBERT SNOW)
- 369 ROY R. MALE, *Hawthorne's Tragic Vision* (HYATT H. WAGGONER)
- 371 PATRICIA THOMSON, *The Victorian Heroine: A Changing Ideal, 1837-1873* (EDGAR F. SHANNON, JR.)
- 373 PER NYKROG, *Les Fabliaux* (ARCHER TAYLOR)
- 375 ROBERT V. MERRILL with ROBERT J. CLEMENTS, *Platonism in French Renaissance Poetry* (ISIDORE SILVER)
- 377 V. S. LUBLINSKY, ed., *Lettres de Voltaire* (PIERRE C. OUSTINOFF)
- 381 ROLAND MORTIER, *Les "Archives Littéraires de l'Europe" (1804-1808) et le cosmopolitisme littéraire sous le Premier Empire* (JACQUELINE E. DE LA HARPE)
- 387 ALFRED GLAUSER, *Hugo et la poésie pure* (MARIO MAURIN)
- 390 RICHARD M. CHADBOURNE, *Ernest Renan as an Essayist* (MICHEL GUGGENHEIM)
- 393 JOHN ANDREW FREY, *Motif Symbolism in the Disciples of Mallarmé* (ROBERT CHAMPIGNY)
- 396 EBERHARD KRANZMAYER, *Historische Lautgeographie des gesamtbairischen Dialektaumes* (FRANK G. BANTA)
- 398 FRANZ KOCH, *Idee und Wirklichkeit* (MARIANNE THALMANN)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
CLIFTON C. CHERPACK
STEFAN EINARSSON
RENÉ N. GIRARD
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
HAROLD JANTZ
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
KARL LUDWIG SELIG
CHARLES S. SINGLETON
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$6.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md., Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

ad

g-

ry

no-

y)

kt-

ough

6.25

1.00.

ould

Md.

t be

for-

iber.

ripts

The

very

turn

are

Md.,

e of

gress,

n
l
r

C

of
c
a
e
a
a
e
h

C
a
h
l
a
h
a
c

modern language notes

VOL. LXXIII, NO. 5, MAY 1958

Genesis 1316

The two verses which make up line 1316 of the Old-English *Genesis*: *ongann ofostlice / þæt hof wyrcean* ("began quickly to make the 'ark'"), although they make good sense and scan properly, do not alliterate. Christian W. M. Grein, in his 1857 edition of the poem,¹ emended the *þæt*, which appears in the MS as the usual crossed-thorn abbreviation,² to *ýþ*, thereby obtaining, with little violence to the text, a reading which supplies both the missing alliteration and an apparently somewhat more precise designation of the ark, *ýþ-hof* ("wave-house," "domus marina, navis").³

¹ C[hristian] W. M. Grein, ed., *Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie* (Göttingen, 1857), I, 35. Theodor Braasch, in his 'Vollständiges Wörterbuch zur sog. Caedmonschen Genesis,' *Anglistische Forschungen*, Band 76 (Heidelberg, 1933), lists *ýþ-hof* for *Gen* 1316 and translates it 'Wogenhof, Arche.' Ferdinand Holthausen, in his separate edition of the poem, *Die ältere Genesis* . . . (Heidelberg, 1914), adopts Grein's emendation of the line. George Philip Krapp, in his *The Junius Manuscript (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, Vol. I; New York, 1931)* from which volume, or later volumes in this series, all succeeding quotations in this article are taken, with slight changes in the direction of a normalized spelling, does not print Grein's emendation in his transcription of the text itself.

² I have seen only the facsimile: Israel Gollancz, *The Caedmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Biblical Poetry, Junius XI* . . . (Oxford, 1927), MS p. 66. For a perhaps more easily available reproduction of this page of the MS see also Margaret Rickert, *Painting in Britain: The Middle Ages* (London: Penguin Books, 1954), plate 44. Line 1316, which takes up about half of the second line on this page, is clearly and unambiguously written.

³ *Domus marina, navis*, are Grein's rendering of *ýþ-hof*. See C[hristian] W.

Unfortunately for Grein's emendation the singer has made it clear that he considers *hof* ("enclosed area, building")⁴ by itself as an adequate designation for the ark of Noah. At lines 1345 and 1489 he again uses *hof* to designate the ark, only at these points he unmistakably provides the other verse of the line with the proper h-alliteration:

3ewit þú nú mid híwum on þæt hof gangan (1345)
 ("Depart now with [your] family to go into the ark")
 of þæm héan hofe híwan léd þú (1489)
 ("from the high ark lead your family")

At line 1489 he has reinforced his choice of *hof* with the additional alliteration provided by the adjective *héan*.

Furthermore, although he uses several other synonyms for ark (*scip*, *mere-hús*, *fær*, *earc*, *mere-cest*, *zeofon-hús*, *sund-reced*, *wæg-bord*), the singer of *Genesis A* does not use *ýþ-hof* either in the ark passages or elsewhere. According to Grein's *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*⁵ only one singer, Cynewulf, in *Elene* 252, uses *ýþ-hof*: *eald ýþ-hofu, / ancrum fæste* ("old wave-houses fast at anchor"). But even this tenuous support by analogy for Grein's emendation totters when we discover that this reading of *Ele* 252 is itself an emendation of what appears in the MS in *ýþ-liofu*.⁶

Despite the fact that Grein's emendation has little to support it, I do not think we need despair of determining a good reading of this line. Grein's emendation seems to be based on the notion that a scribe slipped; I should like to suggest the possibility that the *singer*⁷ slipped, and that his slip can teach us something of his craft.

The singer, who must usually have thought of the off-verse even as he was making his on-verse in order to compose his line with the

M. Grein, *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*, reedited by F[erdinand] Holthausen and J[ohan] J. Köhler (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1912), under *ýþ-hof*.

⁴ Grein-Köhler, *ibid.*, under *hof*, list a variety of senses for *hof* ranging from *domus* to *Hölle*.

⁵ *Ibid.*, see *ýþ-hof*.

⁶ The emendation to *ýþ-hofu* at this point makes sense. The foregoing arguments, it might be pointed out, are not intended to suggest that the compound *ýþ-hof* did not or could not have existed in Old-English poetry. Too little of that poetry has survived for us to draw such a conclusion simply because the compound is not recorded. The question is whether it is justifiable to supply that compound at *Gen* 1316.

⁷ The term 'singer' and all that it implies is used in this paper with precisely the signification it has in Francis P. Magoun's excellent general introduction to the study of the traditional style of Old-English poetry, 'Oral-Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry,' *Speculum*, xxviii (July, 1953), 446-67.

proper alliteration, probably intended to say *þæt hof*, as lines 1345 and 1489 would appear to indicate. What he probably did *not* intend to say was *ofostlíce*. He *might* have rescued the alliteration by saying something like *ýþ-hof* after he had said *ofostlíce*; the evidence of the MS seems to indicate that he did not, completing the line without alliteration.

The singer of *Gen A* uses *ofostlíce* at only one other point in his poem. At line 2850, however, he has built alliteration into his line: *Ʒewít þú ofostlíce, / Ábrahám, fáran . . .* ("Depart quickly, Abraham, to go . . ."). He has composed this line, incidentally, in a manner reminiscent of line 1345; indeed, he has begun this line with the very same formula with which he began 1345 and has ended it with *fáran*, metrically equal to and synonymous with *gangan*. Just before line 1345 he had composed with a different verb in a different tense but in very similar fashion the line under discussion: he began line 1316 with the finite preterit *ongann* and ended it with the dependent infinitive *wyrán*.

This brief comparison of the structure of these three lines can serve to indicate something of the singer's ways of composing and to focus our attention on the three different alliterative cores of these lines. At line 1345 the singer has solved the alliterative problem presented by his use of *hof* by alliterating it with *hiwum*; at line 1489 he recalled and reused this same alliterating pair of words.⁸ At line 2850 he has provided *ofostlíce* and *Ábrahám* as the alliterating words of a line the extremes of which are synonymous with the extremes of 1345 and similar to those of 1316.

But at line 1316 he did not provide a core which alliterates. I suggest that he failed to provide alliteration not because he failed to think ahead to *hof* but precisely because, having thought that far ahead, he completed the first verse of the line too quickly. He was led into this mis-saying by two causes. First, and more generally, he was making a line of a sort which allowed him to vary in order to achieve alliteration the second and third measures, a line in which he readily used *ofostlíce* as the second measure as both this line and 2850 demonstrate. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, his speaking of *ongann* apparently triggered his speaking of *ofostlíce*, and, because he was a good singer and no fumbler, he swept on to save the line at the cost of alliteration.

⁸ Line 1489 ends with an imperative, *læd þú*, which recalls the *Ʒewít þú* with which 1345 begins.

Except in this instance the singer of *Gen A* does not employ *ongann* and *ofostlice* in the same verse. Two later singers do. Both the singer of *Guthlac* and Cynewulf in his *Elene* have each at one point composed a verse of the two formulas *ongann þá* and *ofostlice*:

Ongann þá ofostlice
to his wine-dryhtne wordum maðelian . . . (*Glc* 1201-2)
("Began then quickly to speak to his lord")
Ongann þá ofostlice eorla menigu
to flote fýsan. (*Ele* 225-6)
("Began then quickly many men to hasten to sea.")

The usage of these two later singers appears to reinforce the probability of an easy—in the *Genesis* singer's case a *too* easy—association in the minds of the singers of the Anglo-Saxon tradition between the two formulas, whenever, of course, vowel-alliteration will bind the two verses of the singer's line together.

But the singer of *Gen A* does not seem to have been seeking vowel-alliteration in 1316. Apparently he had thought ahead to the h-alliteration of *hof*. What he needed in the second measure of verse 1316a, then, was an h-alliterating word or phrase. What he appears to have wanted was an h-alliterating adverb meaning "quickly." Tricked by the association of *ofostlice* with *ongann* and by the semantic and rhythmic similarity of the two adverbs he thus said *ofostlice* where he meant, I believe, *hrædlíce*.⁹

The singer of *Gen A* does not use *hrædlíce* elsewhere in his poem. That in a poem of over 2900 lines he employed the metrically equivalent and synonymous *ofostlice* only twice, however, weakens any argument against the proposed reading based on the assumption that because he did not employ *hrædlíce* elsewhere in his poem he could not have employed it here.

A slip of this sort, if I have correctly explained it, would seem to provide a small piece of evidence about the nature of the recording we know as *Gen A*. Had the singer of *Gen A* been his own scribe it seems unlikely¹⁰ that he would have let his error stand. He might,

⁹ *hrædlíce* appears in this same position, as the crowded second measure, in at least five lines: *Bwif* 356 and 963, *And* 192 and 936, and *Chr* 263. It appears as the fourth measure of *And* 1505 and *Ele* 1086.

¹⁰ Unlikely, but not, of course, impossible. It may have been the scribe who inadvertently substituted one synonym for another, as the A-scribe of British Museum MS. Cotton Vitellius A XV seems to have done at *Bwif* 965 where *hand-gripe* appears instead of the properly alliterating and synonymous *mund-gripe*. The very time it takes to write *ofostlice*, however, seems to me to weigh against scribal inadvertence at *Gen* 1316.

although of course at the risk of interrupting the flow of his composing, have stopped to erase; on the other hand he might, because he had the longer time it takes to write than to speak in which to compose his verse, have caught the error before he wrote it. If, however, the singer was unfamiliar with the mysteries of writing and erasing, and if he *was* used to the demands of a *performance* in which mistakes of this sort were better than fumbles—if, indeed, he was unaware that a mistake *could* be corrected by the use of a razor—he would very likely have completed his line as the MS appears to indicate that he did.

The line of reasoning we have been following appears at this point to fork. If we take one of the forks, we shall keep the MS reading of 1316 as it is not simply because the scribe of *Junius XI* and the scribe of the original MS apparently intended to write both *ofostlíce* and *þæt hof*, but more importantly because the singer apparently *spoke* the line as the scribes have recorded it. If we take the other fork, we shall emend the line because the singer apparently intended to say *ongann* [*hrædlíce*] / *þæt hof wyréan*.

Brown University

ROBERT P. CREED

Dialectal English *pie*

Halliwell (1847)¹ lists a word *PIE* with the definition: "The beam or pole that is erected to support the gin for loading and unloading timber. It is also called *pie-tree*." The *Encyclopaedic Dictionary* (1894)² also records *PIE*: "The beam supporting the gin for loading timber"; it may merely be reflecting Halliwell. Neither Halliwell nor the *Encyclopaedic Dictionary* indicates where it has found *pie*; neither gives a date nor cites a text. Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*,³ which has drawn upon so many provincial and regional glossaries, makes no mention of this word *pie*. I have not seen it in any standard dictionary.

There is no reason, however, to question Halliwell's trustworthiness

¹ J. O. Halliwell, *A Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words* (London, 1847 and later editions): s. v. *PIE* (7).

² *The Encyclopaedic Dictionary*, ed. Robert Hunter (Syndicate Publishing Co., Phila., 1894): s. v. *PIE* (2), 1, 1 (3). I am indebted to my colleague Professor J. Darbelnet, for this reference.

³ Joseph Wright, *The English Dialect Dictionary* (London, 1898-).

in recording *pie* nor to doubt that this technical term is old. The professions and trades have preserved many old words in their special application to tools and instruments. Halliwell makes no suggestion as to the etymology of *pie*. The *Encyclopaedic Dictionary* lists it under *PIE* [Lat. *PICA*] 'magpie,' evidently considering it to be the same word, but it does not venture to explain the semantic relationship between the two. The identification seems to be a mere random conjecture, probably prompted by the homophony of the two words. There are said to be upwards of eight hundred pairs of homonyms in English; each member of a pair has a source distinct from the other.

I believe that we have in English dialectal *pie*, a descendant of an ONorm. *pie*, verbal noun derived from the Old Norman verb *pier*, dialectal equivalent of OFr. *puier* (< Lat. **PODIARE* < *PŌDIUM*; *REW*³ 6627) 'appuyer' (cf. OFr. *apui*, F *appuyer*). Old Norman *pier* appears for OFr. *puier*, for example, in the Norman *Chronique des ducs de Normandie* by Benoît de Sainte-Maure (12th century):

Des qu'as murs sunt Costentineis,
Pient [puient] et versent a vigor,
Que tot prennent desqu'a la tor.⁴

Old Norman *pie* is then a dialectal form corresponding to OFr. *puie*, itself a verbal noun derived from OFr. *puier*. Old French *puie*⁵ had the general sense 'appui' and also numerous related special meanings: 'rampe, parapet, pile d'un pont, balustrade, balcon, dossier.' Although OFr. *puier* (ONorm. *pier*) and OFr. *puie* are but scantily represented in the modern patois of northern France, noun descendants of OFr. *apui* (ONorm. *apier*) mean 'supports' of various kinds comparable to E *pie*: 'bois servant à soutenir provisoirement la porte du toit de la couche (t. de houilleur)'; 'colonne de bois qui supporte les charpentes des loges ou des hangars'; 'étau pour bâtisses comme pour arbres'; 'support en bois pour étayer une branche trop chargée de fruits'; etc.⁶

Old French *puier* (v.) was pronounced *pier* in Old Norman with early disappearance of the semi-vowel *u* in the rising diphthong *ui*,

⁴ The passage is cited by F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française* (Paris, 1881-): s. v. *PUIER*.

⁵ Godefroy, *op. cit.*: s. v. *PUIE*; cf. also *APUIE*, synonym of *puie*.

⁶ W. von Wartburg, *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Berlin, 1927-) s. v. *APPUDIARE*. I am indebted to Mr. von Wartburg who sent me in advance of its publication the article *PODIUM* destined for the *FEW*. An ONorm. *apier* is assured by present day Norman patois verb forms: *appiier* (Le Havre), *appié* (Manche), *appiéter* (Manche); see *FEW*, *APPUDIARE*.

a phenomenon which can be dated as early as the twelfth century.⁷ A widespread characteristic of modern Norman patois is this pronunciation of *i* for French *ui*, which has subsisted since the Middle Ages.⁸ Old Norman *pie* (OFr. *puie*) furnished the stem of E *pier* 'support of a bridge, etc.,' corresponding to OFr. *puiere* (OFr. *puie* + *iere* < Lat. -ARIA) and is also the root of English dialectal (Dorset and Somerset) *pier* 'a handrail on a narrow wooden foot-bridge.'⁹

It is interesting to note that ONorm. *pie* (OFr. *puie*), of which E *pier* is a derivative, itself came over to England from Normandy. English *pie* doubtless owes its conservation to its technical application in the language of lumbermen to "the beam or pole that is erected to support the gin for loading and unloading timber."

Bowdoin College

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Impingham's Borrowings from Chaucer

Some hitherto unprinted Middle-English proverbs, set down in thirteen couplets, are preserved uniquely in fair copy in British Museum MS. Harley 7333, fol. 121^v-122^r, ascribed therein to one Impingham (composer, compiler, copyist?), concerning whose identity I have no sensible theory.¹ Professor Manly, in his description of Harley MS. 7333, a "library" miscellany (c 1460) which contains an important text of *The Canterbury Tales* as well as items by Gower, Lydgate and Hoccleve, speculated that these proverbs might have been written by Benedict Burgh, a copy of whose *Cato* is preserved on fol. 57^r-62^r, and who was a prebend of Empingham, Rutland, from 1463-1477.²

The verses deserve to be printed, for the following reasons: they contain five Chaucer allusions, which are noted below; they provide

⁷ See my article "Etymology of English *pier*" in *Romance Philology*, x (1957), pp. 196-201, where I have traced the history of Norman *i* = French *ui*.

⁸ H. Moisy, *Dictionnaire de patois normand* (Caen, 1887), p. 495; Moisy calls attention to the "syncope de l'u devant i en dialecte normand."

⁹ *Romance Philol.*, x (1957), pp. 196-201.

¹ See Carleton Brown and Rossell H. Robbins, *The Index to Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943), No. 2290. For a useful listing of ME proverb collections see Sanford B. Meech, "A Collection of Proverbs in Rawlinson MS D 328," *MP*, xxxviii (1940-41), 113 ff.

² See John M. Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of The Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), I, 215.

another small exception to the anonymous character of surviving secular and devotional ME verse; they augment the significant corpus of ME monitory, anti-feminine complaint literature, which has been studied with care and perception by Professor Francis Lee Utley.²

The transcription which follows incorporates modern punctuation and capitalization, and silently expands a few obvious abbreviations. It is reproduced herewith through the kind permission of the authorities of The British Museum.

- 1 Next þe derke nyght þe gray morow,
So is ioye next the ende of sorow.
Yf a man be in o poynt agrevid
In a noþer he may be relevid.
- 5 Gode it is a man to bere him even
For al day men mete at vnset steven.
Wyne and women make men folls;
Ofte men falle betwyxst two stoles.
Beware of hem that can no shame --
- 10 Womens tonges be neuer lame.
Wylde bestes men may meke,
But women answeris ben neuer to seke.

(fol. 122r)

- Yf a woman be fresshe arayed & gay
Sche ne wille hir howse kepe a day.
- 15 Þerfore bete wel hir skynne
And than she wolle kepe hir þerin.
A man shulde wedde aftir his estate
For yought & age be ofte at debate:
For the fresshe month of May & Janyuer

ll. 1-2 Adapted from Chaucer's *Troilus*, i. 951-952. Perhaps read *gay* for MS. *gray* since a sharp antithesis is indicated, as in Chaucer's "And next the derke nyght the glad morwe (Robinson's text)" and in the parallels cited by Skeat, *Early English Proverbs* (Oxford, 1910), p. 64.

ll. 3-4 Adapted from Chaucer's *Reeve's Tale*, A 4181-82. Robinson records that in the margin of MS Ha is noted the legal maxim: "Qui in uno gravatur in alio debet relevari."

ll. 5-6 Adapted from Chaucer's *Knights Tale*, A 1523-24.

l. 7 Cf. *Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs* (Oxford, 1935), p. 591; M. P. Tilley, *A Dictionary of Proverbs in England* (Ann Arbor, 1950), W 696; Utley, No. 387.

l. 8 Cf. Tilley, S 900.

l. 11 *meke*, vb., "to subdue, make meek."

l. 12 I.e., "Women are never without an answer." Cf. B. J. Whiting, *Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), p. 50; Tilley, W 654, W 670.

ll. 17-18 Adapted from Chaucer's *Miller's Tale*, A 3229-30.

l. 19 A reference to Chaucer's *Merchant's Tale*.

² See Francis L. Utley, *The Crooked Rib* (Columbus, Ohio, 1944), No. 213.

- 20 Ofte ben at debate & gretlye they ware.
 Be ware the wele whan women wepe;
 þ^t women wot not for counsel thei kepe.
 Lo! she that þee have hard of telle
 þ^t causid Adam to go to helle,
 25 Also she made oure Lorde God to dye.
 Lo! such a cast a woman can pleye!

Quod Impingham

- l. 21 Cf. Tilley, W 638; as well as numerous citations s. v. "crocodile tears."
 l. 22 I. e., "Women conceal (keep counsel) only what they do not know";
 cf. Tilley, W 649.
 l. 24 MS. has *hir husband* deleted after *Adam*.

University of Florida

R. H. BOWERS

Donne's Gold-Leaf and his Compasses

More often than has usually been appreciated by his critics Donne's conceits turn out to be connected by complex associations, which, when we discover them, give his poetry a greater degree of coherence. I propose to demonstrate this by adding one more note to the many which have already clustered round the famous image of the compasses in *A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning*.

It has not, I think, previously been noticed that the immediately preceding image, in which the conjoint souls are compared to gold 'to avery thinnesse beate,' actually suggests the compass image itself, since the current chemical symbol for gold was ☉,¹ which occurs in the table of transmutations, and also in the run of printed texts with case endings, e. g. ☉ i, for *auri*. We may therefore re-write Donne's lines thus:

Like ☉ to avery thinnesse beate.
 If they be two, they are two so
 As stiffe twin compasses are two,

which makes the transitional association self-evident.

Donne could have encountered this symbol for gold in certain Paracelsian medical and alchemical texts which there is excellent evidence that he had read, and in one of these which was very widely

¹ Paracelsus, *Opera Omnia* (Geneva 1658), II, p. 99b. The Geneva edition in Latin is a reprint of the Frankfurt edition of 1603 probably used by Donne.

known at the time, the tractate entitled *Paragranum*,² he could also have found the following close parallel to the compass image itself: "In puncto enim non minus circulus existit, ac in ipso cyclo. Iam quanto maior est cyclo respectu puncti? Et tamen utrique integri sunt. Sicut ergo fieri potest, ut circini pes immobilis circulum ducat, alter autem mobilis spatiosam peripheriam: sic aequale ac simile incrementum est magnitudinis hominis respectu coeli. Similiter etiam in decremento a coelo versus hominem veluti radii ab ambitu in punctum suum redeunt."

The main features of Donne's image are capable of being suggested by this passage, the integral relationship of centre and circumference, the fixed foot, the far-roaming foot which gives the spacious periphery, even the final return to the centre.

Various sources and analogues which have been suggested from time to time are discussed by Professor Allen in a note in *MLN* (LXXI, pp. 256-7), in which he adds to the array an interesting parallel from Guarini. It should be observed that none of these compass images antedates the Huser and Bodenstein editions of Paracelsus in the 1570's, which initiated the first phase of his European vogue. Two of the authors mentioned had some reason to be familiar with Paracelsian literature, Du Monin because he wrote on the nature of metals and on medicine, Mersenne as a professional philosopher and theologian. Although there is less probability in supposing Guarini to have known any of this material, he did not begin *Il Pastor Fido* until 1582, by which time the Paracelsian jargon might have spread a little from its revival centre in Basel.

Whether Donne knew Guarini or not is a matter of conjecture: we know on his own authority that he had read some Paracelsus. None of the other sources cited provides the natural transition from the idea 'gold' to the idea 'compasses' which the Paracelsian texts supply, and this fact seems to me conclusive proof of their relevance here.

Sheffield

W. A. MURRAY

² *Ibid.*, I, 201. On Donne's familiarity with this material see Mrs. E. M. Simpson's re-issue of her *Prose Works of John Donne* and also an article of mine in *R. E. S.*, Vol. xxv, No. 98.

Herrick's "Upon Julia's Clothes"

A submerged metaphor, which for the sake of brevity, I should like to call the "angler angled," permeates the texture of Herrick's "Upon Julia's Clothes."

Whenas in silks my Julia goes
Then, then, methinks, how sweetly flows
That liquefaction of her clothes.

Next, when I cast mine eyes, and see
That brave vibration, each way free—
O, how that glittering taketh me!

The natural element for Julia is her clothing; the natural element for a fish is water. But the suggestiveness of "goes," "flows," and "liquefaction," indicates that Julia's element, by analogy, also is water. What Herrick implies, then, is that Julia and the fish are beautiful in their elements, silk and water. Expanding the metaphor in the second stanza, Herrick writes, "cast mine eyes" and see the "brave vibrations each way free"; "cast" of course is part of the angler's vocabulary, and the phrase "brave vibrations" suggests how Julia is like a fish. Perhaps "brave" should be read with its variant meanings of wild, fierce, savage, or dangerous; certainly, referring to Julia's clothes, it means superior, excellent, or fine. But the paradoxical ambiguity implied in this and other words enriches the poem if we retain variant meanings. Immediately and at the most dramatic moment, the glittering, vibrating fish, or Julia in her liquid and flowing clothes, instead of being taken by the fisherman, or poet, catches him: "Oh, how that glittering taketh me!" "Take" like "cast" forms part of the angler's special stock of words: to rise to bait, to bite, or to capture, and it retains its libidinous connotations, emphasizing the sensuous character of the relationship.

The poem, then, on the level of the submerged metaphor contains a comparison of the angler angling for a fish, hovering, gleaming in the water, with the poet's viewing Julia, flowing, glittering in or out of her silks. The reversal at "taketh me" strikes us with the full force of Herrick's sensuous, many-sided, ironic wit: the hunter hunted, the angler angled, the pursuer pursued and captured.

Brown University

LOUIS H. LEITER

A Damsel with a Dulcimer: An Interpretation of Poe's "Eleonora"

"Eleonora" is usually referred to in critiques of Edgar Allan Poe's works as a beautifully written poetic sketch, so obviously autobiographical as to require little explication. Professor Craig, almost alone, has been principally concerned with the *meaning* of the tale: in 1935 he wrote that "Eleonora" is an allegorical effort "to reach supernal beauty," containing "the devices of poetry as well as the subject-matter of poetry."¹ Subsequent critics, however, have continued to express interest only in those aspects of the story which could have been drawn from Poe's personal experience. Consequently, I would like to explore Professor Craig's brief suggestion in an attempt to show that, quite apart from its possibly autobiographical basis, "Eleonora" is a careful, rather specific allegorical statement expressing some of Poe's poetical concepts.

The first evidence that "Eleonora" is not simply a reflection of Poe's immediate experience is that certain topographical features come, not from Maryland, but from Xanadu. Probably the clearest echo of "Kubla Khan" occurs in Poe's description of the River of Silence—"winding stealthily about in mazy courses" (cf. the river Alph, "meandering with a mazy motion.") In the Valley of Many-Colored Grass there are "dazzling," "devious" "rivulets" which recall the "bright," "sinuous rills" of Xanadu. Coleridge's twice five miles were "girdled round" with walls and towers; "And here were forests ancient as the hills, / Enfolding sunny spots of greenery." Poe's domain was "encircled" by mountains; within this vale were "spots . . . from the river to the mountains that girdled it in . . . carpeted all by a soft, green grass. . . ."

Of course, the landscapes of romantic writing are crowded with rills and greenery, but the closeness of this phraseology suggests that the relation is not accidental. Moreover, other traces of "Kubla Khan" may be noted throughout "Eleonora." In Xanadu's "fertile ground . . . bright with sinuous rills . . . blossomed many an incense-bearing tree." In Poe's valley, along the river "brighter than all save the eyes of Eleonora" and containing "pearly pebbles . . . shining on gloriously forever," there is "the foliage of many thousands of

¹ Margaret Alterton and Hardin Craig, *Edgar Allan Poe: Representative Selections* (New York, 1935), p. cii.

forest trees . . . the glories of many millions of fragrant flowers . . . soft green grass . . . vanilla-perfumed . . . besprinkled throughout with the yellow buttercup, the white daisy, the purple violet, and the ruby-red asphodel. . . ." Poe does not use the word *dome* in the story, but note his culminating description of the entire valley following the consummation of the love of the cousins. In effect, he describes a dome of pleasure, even a sunny dome, a dome in air:

And now, too, a voluminous cloud, which we had long watched in the regions of Hesper, floated out thence, all gorgeous in crimson and gold, and settling in peace above us, sank, day by day, lower and lower, until its edges rested upon the tops of the mountains, turning all their dimness into magnificence, and shutting us up, as if forever, within a magic prison-house of grandeur and of glory.

Another echo of "Kubla Khan" is sounded by the first-person narrator of "Eleonora." When he refers to his "glorious madness," as he verges on "the great secret," and speaks of his "delirium, and the spirit-lifting ecstasy" of his adoration of the "ethereal Ermengarde," his phrases recall Coleridge's picture of the bewitched poet. Also, Eleonora is strikingly akin to the damsel with a dulcimer. Both serve as a source of inspiration. One is an Abyssinian maid; Poe's maiden dwells "beneath a tropical sun." One plays on a dulcimer and sings of Mount Abora; the other's musical voice, twice mentioned in connection with the harp of Aeolus, promises the revelation of secrets in Heaven. Both depart, leaving the poet and lover haunted by the vision the maidens had inspired. Coleridge conjectures, "Could I revive within me / Her symphony and song," "I would build that dome in air," and it would be deemed that he had "drunk the milk of Paradise." Eleonora, dying, pledges that if it is "beyond the power of the souls in Paradise" to permit her return she would give her lover "frequent indications of her presence." After her death "the lulling melody that had been softer than the wind-harp of Aeolus and more divine than all save the voice of Eleonora" dies away; the music of Eleonora is revived, however, in the person of the "angelic" Ermengarde, and the latter's union with the narrator receives the sanction of Eleonora's "familiar and sweet voice."

The similarity between the narrator of "Eleonora" and the speaker in "Kubla Khan" suggests that the "madness" of this Poe character is different from the derangement of the speaker in such stories as "Berenice" and "Ligeia." Miss Elisabeth Schneider has pointed

out that the statement of the last few lines of "Kubla Khan" is merely "the ancient conventional description of the poet with his 'eye in a fine frenzy rolling.'" ² In "Eleonora" the emotional frenzy of the lover in the concluding passages presents a similar picture. To be sure, Poe has not described the lover in the conventional terms employed by Coleridge, but reference to *The Poetic Principle* makes it impossible to conclude that he is just describing the reactions of a youth in love. In this essay Poe lists some thirty elements which give a more "distinct conception of what the true Poetry is"; over half of these "simple elements" are identical with descriptive passages in "Eleonora." For example, the poet recognizes his inspiration in

the volutes of the flower . . . the slanting of tall, Eastern trees—in the blue distance of mountains—in the groupings of clouds—in the twinkling of half-hidden brooks—in the gleaming of silver rivers . . . in the songs of birds—in the harp of Aeolus—in the sighing of the night-wind . . . in the scent of the violet . . . in the suggestive odour that comes . . . over dim oceans, illimitable and unexplored.³

In the preceding paragraph of *The Poetic Principle*, Poe comments that "Love—the true, the divine Eros . . . is unquestionably the purest and truest of all poetical themes." In this context, the statement of the lover in "Eleonora"—"We had drawn the god Eros from that wave"—provides a clue to Poe's intention in the story. The narrator is a symbol of the poet, and the love he feels for his cousin transcends the mere nostalgic evocation of Poe's pristine ardor for his wife Virginia and exemplifies poetic inspiration. That Eleonora herself is a personification of that which "far above all" induces "the true poetical effect" is reinforced by Poe's dictum in *The Poetic Principle*—beyond all else, the poet is inspired by the beauty, grace and love of woman ⁴—for in the essay he develops the idea in phrases almost identical with those characterizing Eleonora. Moreover, Poe makes the same point allegorically in the story: After Eleonora and her cousin draw "the god Eros from that wave," there follows a paean to creativity. As a result of their union, "strange brilliant

² Elisabeth Schneider, *Coleridge, Opium and Kubla Khan* (Chicago, 1953), p. 17.

³ James A. Harrison, *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe* (New York, 1902), xiv, 290-291. Each of these phrases may be traced in "Eleonora," but particularly interesting is the last with its echo of the statement that those who approach the "great secret" "*agressi sunt mare tenebrarum, quid in eo esset exploraturi.*"

⁴ *Ibid.*, 291.

flowers . . . gay glowing birds . . . golden and silver fish" appear. The relation of creativity to poetry is specifically cited in Poe's review of Longfellow's *Ballads*, written a few months after the publication of "Eleonora." "We thus clearly deduce the *novelty*, the *originality*, the *invention*, the *imagination*, or lastly the *creation* of BEAUTY, (for the terms as here employed are synonymous) as the essence of all Poesy."⁶

But Eleonora dies and the forms of life which had suddenly burst forth now disappear. After an interim period the narrator meets Ermengarde, and in some mysterious way his love for her is affirmed consistent with his pledge of fidelity to Eleonora. The introduction of Ermengarde makes for some difficulty in the interpretation of the story.⁶ Professor Craig submits that the "great secret" referred to in the first paragraph is to be explained by duality: "One part of the nature of Eleonora vanishes and she reappears as Ermengarde clad in the other part of her nature."⁷ In the first version of the story, Craig notes, Poe explained this duality as Eleonora's "alternate moods of melancholy and mirth . . . at one instant I fancied her possessed of some spirit of smiles, at another by some demon of fears." This reading, however, overlooks the fact that Ermengarde exhibits the same alternation. Upon her countenance is seen "the identical transition from tears to smiles that I had wondered at in the long-lost Eleonora." In fact, Poe makes no sharp distinction between the two maidens: Three times the adjective *bright* is employed to describe Eleonora—and, "Oh bright was the seraph Ermengarde!" Again, "The loveliness of Eleonora was that of the Seraphim . . . she had been made perfect in loveliness. . . ."—Ermengarde is "a maiden to whose beauty my whole recreant heart yielded at once. . . ." Insofar as the latter is described she does not differ from her predecessor physically or spiritually. In only one sentence are they contrasted. "What indeed was my passion for the young girl of the valley in comparison with the fervor, and the delirium, and the spirit-lifting ecstasy of adoration with which I poured out my whole soul in tears at the feet of the ethereal Ermengarde?"

Thus the distinction between the two maidens is one of degree. The

⁶ *Ibid.*, XI, 73.

⁶ For example, Professor Quinn conjectures, "Perhaps it [the introduction of Ermengarde] was Poe's way of telling Virginia that no matter what happened, she was his mate for eternity." Arthur Hobson Quinn, *Edgar Allan Poe* (New York, 1941), p. 329.

⁷ Alterton and Craig, *op. cit.*, p. ciii.

first evokes passion, the second inspires an "ecstasy of adoration." And these two emotions are not inharmonious "for reasons which shall be made known to thee in Heaven." In this conclusion Poe seems to touch on "the great secret," which has been the underlying concern throughout the story. The narrator through his experiences with the two maidens as they are alternately possessed by "melancholy and mirth" has been led in his "grey visions" to "glimpses of eternity." "Upon the verge of the great secret" he learns something of the "wisdom which is of good" and "knowledge which is of evil." Again, a passage from *The Poetic Principle* may illuminate Poe's meaning. There is a thirst, he says, which

belongs to the immortality of Man. . . . It is no mere appreciation of the Beauty before us—but a wild effort to reach the Beauty above. Inspired by an ecstatic prescience of the glories beyond the grave, we struggle, by multi-form combinations among the things and thoughts of Time, to attain a portion of that Loveliness whose very elements, perhaps, appertain to eternity alone. And thus when by Poetry . . . we find ourselves melted into tears—we weep . . . through a certain, petulant, impatient sorrow at our inability to grasp now, wholly, here on earth, at once and for ever, those divine and rapturous joys, of which *through* the poem . . . we attain to but brief and indeterminate glimpses.

The struggle to apprehend the supernal Loveliness—this struggle, on the part of souls fittingly constituted—has given to the world all *that* which it (the world) has ever been enabled at once to understand and *to feel* as poetic.⁸

In accordance with these dicta the statement of the narrator of "Eleonora" concerning the "great secret" of duality is to be explained as the ironic insight (evoking both "joys" and "tears") into divine beauty, an insight afforded by poetry. The poet achieves a vision of supernal beauty through poetic inspiration, but his inspiration also increases his awareness that this beauty is unattainable and that even this vision must be fleeting. The narrator-poet in Poe's story attains this high vision to some extent through the influence of Eleonora, but even as he possesses her "perfect loveliness," she discourses to him "of the last sad change which must befall Humanity." The perfection of Ermengarde surpasses the perfection of Eleonora, however. She is not "the young girl of the valley"; she is a "seraph." This distinction in degree between the two maidens is further explained in two sentences of *The Poetic Principle* which occur just before the passage last cited.

⁸ *Works*, XIV, 273-274.

He who shall simply sing, with however glowing enthusiasm, or with however vivid a truth of description has yet failed to prove his divine title [of poet]. There is still a something in the distance—which he has been unable to attain.

The even more beautiful and seraphic Ermengarde is Poe's vaguely described symbol of that "something in the distance," the unattained supernal beauty.

That he had been led closer to "the great secret" by Ermengarde is implied by the narrator in his introductory statement. In the context of Poe's critical writings the element of mystery in his relation to Ermengarde, together with the fact that she arouses more intense ecstasy than does Eleonora, suggests that the story presents a kind of loose illustration of Poe's conception of the difference between the fancy and the imagination. In a review published the year before "Eleonora" was written, Poe commented on these terms as follows: "... the just distinction between the fancy and the imagination (and which is still but a distinction of degree) is involved in a consideration of the *mystic*." He explains that he uses the term in the "sense of Augustus William Schlegel, and of most other German critics," in reference to "that class of composition in which there lies beneath the transparent upper current of meaning an under or *suggestive* one. What we vaguely term the *moral* of any sentiment is its mystic or secondary expression."⁹ Poe then mentions "Kubla Khan" in a list of several works that are thus "strongly mystic." Poe's perception of this quality of the poem recalls his extensive indebtedness to Coleridge's poetic theories and emphasizes again the relation between Coleridge's poem and Poe's story: the damsel with a dulcimer could inspire the poet to achieve a view of Paradise; the "ethereal Ermengarde" brings about a spirit-lifting ecstasy which leads to the "verge of the great secret,"¹⁰ an ecstasy of more intense degree than that inspired by the "young girl of the valley." Thus Ermengarde seems to represent what Poe called elsewhere the "unlimited range" of the imagination whose "materials extend throughout the universe,"¹¹ a range which is suggested by the Old German meaning of *Ermen*—"universal" or "immense." The assumption that Poe was

⁹ In "Alciphron: A Poem," published in January, 1840. *Works*, x, 65.

¹⁰ In "A Chapter of Suggestions" (*The Opal*, 1845), Poe ranks the imagination supreme among the mental faculties, for it brings man's "soul often to a glimpse of things supernal and eternal—to the very verge of the *great secrets*. These are moments, indeed, in which he perceives the faint perfumes, and hears the melodies of a happier world." *Works*, xiv, 187.

¹¹ In "American Prose Writers" published in January, 1845. *Works*, xii, 39.

aware of the root meaning of *Ermengarde* would do much to explain his choice of this name as one to rank even higher here than *Eleonora*, a variation of his favorite name for ideal beauty, *Helen*.

In "Eleonora," then, Poe has stated allegorically certain concepts which he repeatedly advanced in his essays and reviews. His reproduction in such a work of some of the phrases and ideas of Coleridge is understandable, for scattered throughout Poe's poetry and critical prose are indirect and explicit reflections of the writer who has been established as "the guiding genius of Poe's early intellectual life."¹² It may not be possible to conclude definitely that Poe consciously drew on "Kubla Khan" for his story, or that he intended a fictional representation of his poetic theories; but it does seem certain that he did incorporate these materials in a story which demands attention, not merely as a kind of exquisitely poetic excursus on the idyllic aspects of Poe's love for Virginia Clemm, but as an interesting and illuminating expression of his critical ideas.

Michigan State University

SAM S. BASKETT

The Ethical Dimension of "The Custom House"

Perhaps the chief interest "The Custom House" Introduction holds for the reader today is its statement of Hawthorne's theory of romance, a theory which, as many have noted, profoundly governs the form and content of *The Scarlet Letter*. What has not been as well noted is the relationship between that theory and Hawthorne's theory of the good life. The experiences surrounding Hawthorne's definition of the romance as the meeting ground of the actual and the imaginary are more moral than esthetic, and the realization of the theory in *The Scarlet Letter* governs the moral conclusions Hawthorne would like his reader to draw as well as the subject-matter and its arrangement.

Talking of his experiences as Surveyor of the Customs at Salem, in "The Custom House," Hawthorne asserts that for the most part his colleagues are a "set of wearisome old souls, who had gathered

¹² George E. Woodberry, *The Life of Edgar Allan Poe* (Boston, 1909), I, 177.

nothing worth preservation from their varied experience of life."¹ We can appreciate why these men are wearisome when we consider the two whom he singles out for particular discussion: one is the epitome of what he finds distasteful in his colleagues; the other is an exception who serves to underline his general observation.

The epitome of wearisomeness is the Inspector who has stored his memory with husks and thereby stunted his moral development. He has numbered in his experience three wives, now dead, and twenty children, most of them also dead. "Here," Hawthorne says, "one would suppose, might have been sorrow enough to imbue the sunniest disposition, through and through, with a sable tinge" (34). But this is not so. All the Inspector seems to have gained from life is a concern with the physical present. His main interest and chief topic of conversation is food—the mutton-chop he ate, the hindquarter of veal he will eat—so that he has, in Hawthorne's words, "no higher moral responsibilities than the beasts of the field," and shares the beasts' "blessed immunity from the dreariness and duskiness of age" (35).

The exception to the moral desert which Hawthorne finds in the custom house is the old retired General who is Collector of Customs. Hawthorne sees him as noble and heroic, yet his actual contact with the General is less than with most of his other colleagues:

He seemed away from us, although we saw him but a few yards off; remote, though we passed close beside his chair; unattainable, though we might have stretched forth our hands and touched his own. It might be that he lived a more real life within his thoughts than amid the inappropriate environment of the Collector's office. The evolutions of the parade; the tumult of the battle; the flourish of old, heroic music, heard thirty years before,—such scenes and sounds, perhaps, were all alive before his intellectual sense (40).

From these descriptions of character we can infer an important precept which links Hawthorne's esthetics to his ethics. The implied proposition might be phrased as follows: "Man's inner life can be more real than his outer life." It can be applied in fiction by dealing with the thoughts and emotions of characters as well as with their actions. It is also an ethical proposition because Hawthorne obviously finds that the Collector's inner life makes him a better man than the Inspector, who is much more alive physically but does not seem ever to have reflected.

¹ Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter*, "Riverside Edition" (Boston, 1883), p. 32. Further references are indicated by page numbers in parentheses, immediately following the quotations.

The old General, like Hester Prynne, indulges in his reveries beside a fire, and it is pertinent that the "dim glow of a coal-fire" in the Introduction is as necessary an element of the room which analogizes the romance as are the moon-light and the familiar objects. The ethical formula which precedes the esthetic equation of the actual and the imaginary is one which characterizes the good life as a life which blends the reveries of the past with the actions of the present, which combines morality and materiality. Just as the good romance strikes a balance between the actual and the imaginary, so the man of good character strikes a balance between his inner state and the materiality of the world.

The formula is further developed in "The Custom House" when Hawthorne discusses his own moral condition. He represents himself as the descendant of a family associated with Salem ever since its founding, and he takes sentimental comfort in this genealogy. Indeed, there is the flavor of semi-conscious snobbism in his later reference to the modern aristocracy of Salem as families who can be traced "from the petty and obscure beginnings of their traffic, at periods generally much posterior to the Revolution, upward to what their children look upon as long-established rank" (47). Hawthorne claims a moral quality for his sentiment because it has provided him with a "home-feeling with the past," a feeling which, he goes on to say, he can "scarcely claim with reference to the present phase of the town." Too much of this sentiment can be unhealthy—he is glad his children (like Phoebe Pyncheon) were born and are being bred free of a Salem in which the legacy would be weightier by another generation—but for him it is a good thing. It provides him with a background of experience, albeit vicarious, so that like the old General he can face the materiality of life with a hidden life of his own.

Instead of sitting next to the custom house fire surrounded by his memories, the Surveyor Hawthorne we are presented to pokes about the attic reading the dusty documents of New England's past—his past. The effect, of course, is similar. And just as his life has been given moral quality by its familial link with the past, so when he turns to fiction he develops an artistic link with the past. Surveyor Pue is his literary ancestor, and accounts for the century which lies between that in which the action of *The Scarlet Letter* takes place and that in which Hawthorne occupies the custom house.

The past and present, then, enter into Hawthorne's theory of

experience as counterparts of the distinction between inner-state and materiality; as necessary elements of the view of life which informs the actual-imaginary view of fiction. Romance is an enrichment of the actual by the imaginary. The good life is an enrichment of the material by the inner self, an appreciation of the present through a consciousness of the past. The elements of the good life find their dramatic counterparts in the two basic elements of the romance, and such a good life is, then, the material of the romance.

For this very reason, Hawthorne professed himself dissatisfied with the total achievement of *The Scarlet Letter*. His romance seemed to him too complete an escape into the past, too much concerned with the hidden and too little concerned with the open. A better book than he has written, he tells us in "The Custom House," would be written by the man who could see the "true and indestructible value that lay hidden in the petty and wearisome incidents, and ordinary characters" which surrounded him in Salem; the man who could fathom "the deeper import" of what seemed "dull and commonplace" to Hawthorne (57). When reading these remarks, one thinks of William Dean Howells' description of the crowd on the boat which is taking Tom Corey and Silas Lapham to the latter's summer cottage: "In face they were commonplace, with nothing but the American poetry of vivid purpose to light them up, where they did wholly lack fire."² But whereas Howells' problem was to reveal the fire that lit up commonplace characters and events, Hawthorne's was to discover the commonplace settings which would display his sense of the past's importance. His quarrel with *The Scarlet Letter* is addressed to the overbalance in that book of the half of the dualism embodying the past, the inner state, and the imaginary, so that the virtues of the present, the material, and the actual are underdeveloped. What he wishes is to be able to write about the present, although it may fictionally appear as an earlier period, giving it the values which he associates with the past, but, nevertheless, keeping the actual always in focus so that whatever his characters' dramatic reconciliations with their environment may be they are also reconciliations with materiality. He notes, at the end of "The Custom House," that if he is remembered at all in Salem he will be remembered as the historian of the town pump, the author of the little temperance piece about Salem's early source of water. He wants the contemporaneity

² William Dean Howells, *The Rise of Silas Lapham*, "Modern Library" (New York, 1951), p. 71.

of "A Rill from the Town Pump" to be informed with the morality of *The Scarlet Letter*, but he also wants *The Scarlet Letter* to bear a more immediate relationship to the actual than he feels it does. *The House of the Seven Gables*, for instance, can be seen as Hawthorne's attempt to fuse what he found satisfying in the aforementioned two works so as to produce a work which better balanced the past with the present.

Of course, the generally accepted opinion is that Hawthorne did in *The Scarlet Letter* achieve just such a balance between the actual and the imaginary as he talked of in the introductory sketch, so that the discontent expressed in "The Custom House" should be read merely as an expression of the artist's customary discontent with his finished product in view of the perfection he envisioned. However, if we bear in mind the ethical as well as the esthetic connotation of his theory of romance, we can see that as sound as this opinion may be for the critic of the novel, Hawthorne could not have shared it because he refused to separate the ethics of his content from the beauty of his form. The critic is correct, of course. Hawthorne did achieve a superb balance between the actual and the imaginary in *The Scarlet Letter*. But there was an imbalance for Hawthorne because his theory of the good life did not achieve as successful an embodiment as did his theory of romance: the balancing of the actual and the imaginary should also have been the balancing of the inner state and materiality and the latter blend was not, for Hawthorne, satisfactorily composed.

This can be appreciated by considering the Puritan past which serves as the scene of *The Scarlet Letter*. It provides the characters with precisely that environment in which the secret acts of the soul are matters of public concern, in which the sin of adultery is a crime against the state, in which the scarlet letter, making public the hidden, can be worn with probability. But as esthetically appropriate as the setting may seem, Hawthorne, in the last analysis, found it ethically inappropriate. The Puritan commonwealth might artistically stand for the actual while the superstitions and torments of its citizens might stand for the imaginary, but Hawthorne wanted his actual also to correspond to what he regarded as materiality so that when the dramatic reconciliation of his characters with their environment took place, so would the ethical reconciliation between inner state and materiality occur. This, however, is not the case in *The Scarlet Letter* because the fictional Boston is far too remote from materiality. Any reconciliation of a character's private life with its public life could

hardly be viewed as an instructive achievement with obvious parallels in the nineteenth-century America which Hawthorne viewed from his window.

The idea can be illustrated with reference to Pearl who esthetically stands so well for the meeting place of the actual and the imaginary. However, she also serves to remind us that Boston itself is a dark place. Governor Bellingham sees her at his home, a place reminiscent of old England—of the wider world—with its liveried servant, its old furniture, and its garden, which, significantly, has failed to develop after its English model but has degenerated into little more than a cabbage patch. In this setting, Pearl is a reminder for Bellingham of his "days of vanity in old King James' time." In the same scene, the Reverend John Wilson says of Pearl, "Methinks I have seen just such figures, when the sun has been shining through a richly painted window, and tracing out the golden and crimson images across the floor." He adds, "But that was in the old land" (136).

As Pearl is the organic embodiment of the sin of her parents, that which Dimmesdales must acknowledge in the market-place, so she is also for the Puritan community the embodiment of what they attempted to leave behind when they went into the forest but what they cannot reconcile with their present life, although, to be ethically sound, they must. Boston, which esthetically may stand for the actual, ethically partakes of the hidden half of the dualism because of its suppressed materiality.

Such a community, then, did not ultimately satisfy its creator's moral demands, for it failed to have the hearty materiality, the indulgence in the senses, which he saw in the Salem about him. He comments that the Puritans were, after all, "Native Englishmen, whose fathers had lived in the sunny richness of the Elizabethan epoch; a time when the life of England, viewed as one great mass, would appear to have been as stately, magnificent, and joyous, as the world has ever witnessed" (275). He makes it clear that they should not have denied this heritage, and that the extravagances they have permitted themselves are, unfortunately, exceptions. Esthetically, daily Boston might balance the secret lives of its citizens, but morally it is too much of the same. Chillingworth, for all of the dire effect he has upon Dimmesdale, opens the windows of Dimmesdale's mind to European thoughts, to what is happening in the market-place of the world. If Hester's attempt to get to that world with Dimmesdale is ill-fated, it is not because Boston is ethically the best place, but

because Hester and Dimmesdale have not yet given Boston its due meed. Pearl does so, and is no longer required to languish there but is permitted to mingle the morality which Boston has imposed upon her with the materiality which Boston unhealthily denies.

For *The Scarlet Letter* to have lived up to the theory of romance's ethical demands, then, its Boston would have to have been much more like the Salem which Hawthorne saw from his windows. He did not regret, he tells us, his initial entrance into his duties as Surveyor of Customs. Because he had worked at Brook Farm, mingled with Channing and Thoreau, and been influenced by Emerson and Longfellow, it was a healthy thing for him to get into active life. The Inspector was a necessary antidote for Alcott. He tells us this immediately before expressing his sense of his inability to write a good book about the life around him, in order to absolve the daily activity of the custom house from responsibility for its apparent sterility, a responsibility which, he believed, actually resided in his perception of it. *The Scarlet Letter* disappoints him because the materiality of the life in it is, ultimately, too close to an objectification of the hidden lives of its characters so that his interpretation of the actual and the imaginary is not matched by its ethical counterpart.

This supposed shortcoming of *The Scarlet Letter* explains why Hawthorne's subsequent romances took the direction they did. After his first full-length work, the historical past ceases to be the scene in which Hawthorne set his work, because he wished his scene to provide more of the materiality which entered into his view of the good life than it did in *The Scarlet Letter*. The past, of course, remained an important element of that good life, and, therefore, of the romance's subject-matter, but it was subordinated to the demands of the immediate world of the work, and shaped but did not constitute it. The living are very much in control of *The House of the Seven Gables* as it reaches its resolution.

University of California, Berkeley

LARZER ZIFF

The Narrator of "The Blessed Damsel"

"The Blessed Damsel" has for so long been etherealized as the expression of "longing of the [dead lady] in heaven for her lover

on earth"¹ that one is tempted merely to bow reverently before this apotheosis of the poem and pass quietly on. But if, as Lafcadio Hearn suggests,² Rossetti wished only to portray a sad maiden awaiting her lover in heaven, why did he introduce that earthly lover as the "I" character? What function does the ostensible narrator serve if this is simply a tale of maidenly woe? To regard the earthly lover's comments as nothing more than artificial devices of contrast or dramatic pathos admits a serious structural weakness into the poem by implying that the parentheses serve no truly integral function. I believe a clearer view of the nature and the shortcomings of "The Blessed Damozel" can be achieved by recognizing that they are not only organic, but that they present the true nucleus of the poem.

W. M. Rossetti in his *Memoir* furnishes an insight into the genesis of "The Blessed Damozel":

In 1881 Rossetti gave Mr. Caine an account of its origin, as deriving from his perusal and admiration of Edgar Poe's *Raven*. "I saw" (this is Mr. Caine's version of Rossetti's statement) "that Poe had done the utmost it was possible to do with the grief of the lover on earth, and I determined to reverse the conditions, and give utterance to the yearning of the loved one in heaven." Along with *The Raven*, other poems by Poe . . . were a deep well of delight to Rossetti in all these years.³

Even assuming Caine's version of Rossetti's thirty-four-year-old recollection to be accurate, we need not accept it as *the* definition of the poem's subject. We have no more reason for adopting Rossetti's perhaps imagined, certainly memory-hazed notion of his poem's origins than we have for accepting Poe's rationalization of the composition of "The Raven."

But the evidence certainly shows that Rossetti did associate Poe with "The Blessed Damozel." The aesthetic principle underlying Rossetti's poem is very likely Poe's:

The death . . . of a beautiful woman is, unquestionably, the most poetical topic in the world—and equally is it beyond doubt that the lips best suited for such a topic are those of the bereaved lover.

("The Philosophy of Composition")

¹ Lafcadio Hearn, *Pre-Raphaelites and Other Poets* (New York, 1939), p. 20.

² "This is the story of a woman in heaven, speaking of the man she loved on earth. She is waiting for him. She watches every new soul that comes to heaven, hoping that it may be the soul of her lover. While waiting thus, she talks to herself about what she will do to make her lover happy when he comes, how she will show him all the beautiful things in heaven, and will introduce him to the holy saints and angels. That is all." *Ibid.*

³ *Dante Gabriel Rossetti* (Boston, 1895), I, 107.

The second part of this dictum is often ignored, but it is actually the keystone of Poe's poetics: the death of beauty—Lenore, Ulalume—furnishes merely the situation for many poems, while the true subject is the mental state of the bereaved lover, the progress of disenchantment or delusion in the mind of the speaker.

The parenthetical comments in "The Blessed Damozel" chronicle just this type of disintegration of rationality. Immediately after the opening picture of the Damozel, the lover bemoans his loneliness and permits a first tempting suggestion of supernatural direct contact with her to creep into his mind. Rationally he rejects the hoped-for miracle as illusion; he is still willing (or able) to accept the evidence of his senses as final (ll. 19-23). But seven stanzas later he wonders if other natural phenomena—bird's song and bells—cannot actually be what he dreams they are—her voice, her step (ll. 61-66). Now he does not reject outright the whisperings of delusion; he has passed from initial rational disbelief to chimerical hopefulness.

When we next hear him directly he has fallen victim to his desires and is actually talking with the imagined presence of his love: "Alas! We two, we two, thou say'st!" (l. 97). The splinter of irrepressible yearning has swerved his mind from its groove, and it madly flies through a land of vision drawing even the senses after. When we hear him at poem's end he sees not leaves but "her smile;" he hears not bells and a bird's song but "her tears." The passage of the lover from sane doubt of his vision to irrational belief is completed.

Clearly the poem is, as it were, framed by these parentheses; but more than that, the picture of heaven and the Damozel is presented precisely as the bereaved lover we have seen in the parentheses would envision it. The vision can be regarded entirely as the grieving and lonely lover's projection, embodying his physical earthly preoccupations mingled with normal religious and spiritual ideals: the lady is pictured as she appeared upon earth—but a day dead, warming the gold bar with her physical presence; heaven is seen as a corporeal place of peace and permanence, with distinct geographical relationships to the lover's bitter and mutable earth; the life after is viewed primarily as a time for reunion of lovers.

On the borderline of delusion, the lover transmutes his longing for heaven into the Damozel's powerful yearning toward earth. And, desire and suggestion having breached the levees of rationality, the lover permits himself to be swept into imagining his lady's words. As his sensory impressions had been converted into voices and steps, so

his own thoughts turn into the Damsel's speech; he projects into her mouth a combination of his own desires and his own fears. The lover tries to separate his fear from his hope by restricting doubt to his own mind, where it may interrupt the happy vision (ll. 97-102), but not permitting it to intrude into his imagined lady's speech, where it will destroy all. Fear does, however, creep into the vision (e.g. ll. 72, 102), and when the Damsel reaches her request to Christ (ll. 127-132), in effect the lover's request through her—the pure maiden's—mediation, the tone has grown desperate as anxiety effaces the brief hope.

The melancholy which by now pervades the poem is not merely that of temporary separation to be assuaged by eternal bliss, but that of serious doubt of bliss. The lover mistrusts his qualifications for heaven, perhaps even disbelieves the heaven he wishes exists, and his projection of the lady of course reflects these doubts. The key final passage, which Hearn "explains" as the lady's disappointment that the angels do not now bring her lover's soul, cannot be so simply and happily glossed. The last lines are bitter and sad, they leave one depressed and hopeless; and they conclude the poem by focussing upon the central subject—the earthly lover. The Damsel has put on a false front for the angels, smiling as a soul in heaven should, as her lover hopes she can. But left alone she is no longer able to maintain the front and collapses into the tears which lie at her heart and at the heart of her dreamer. His delusion, now complete, no longer can support a wish-fulfilling vision of heaven, but dissolves into anxious tears utterly and morosely terrestrial.

We can see how the entire poem, not merely the parentheses, is concerned with the bereaved lover's mind. "The Blessed Damsel" carries Poe's examination of the deluded lover to the point at which the delusion—the Damsel in heaven—is presented as the reality, and the reality—the grieving lover—as a passing, shadowy parenthesis.

This perhaps extreme statement does, I believe, have the virtue of focussing our attention on the poem's true core: the dramatic picture of delusion. Such an analysis also helps silence charges of sentimentality and vulgarity. Such failings have been located not in the vehicle but in the tenor as it was conceived by critics like Hearn—the "sentimentality" of the sad maiden and the "vulgarity" of a too-corporeal heaven are really products of interpretation, not of the poem itself.

The view I have proposed does, however, open "The Blessed

Damozel" to another kind of complaint. In looking at the whole piece, I fear it must be admitted that consistency in tone and direction are perhaps more apparent in the analysis than in the poem. Rossetti, like his speaker, evidently became fascinated with the lady's sad speech and concentrated more upon its pathos than upon its correlation with the narrator's state of mind. Thus he failed to formulate the poem consistently either as a Poesque study in delusion or as the story of a sad spirit in heaven. That the core of the poem is dramatic, I think we have seen; that the drama tends to be eclipsed by the bright vision of the Damozel, I think we cannot finally contradict.⁴

Dartmouth College

PAUL LAUTER

Fall and Winter in Frost

The basic analogical implications of fall and winter have provided Robert Frost with a ready-made scale upon which to play innumerable metaphorical variations. His recurrent use of imagery from these seasons indicates a pattern of form and theme in which the end-seasons reveal what Kenneth Burke calls "implicit equations" and "associational clusters." And we may, by examining this fall-winter pattern, as Burke points out, "find . . . what goes with what within this cluster, what kinds of acts and images and personalities and situations go with his notions of heroism, villainy, consolation, despair, etc."¹

Almost one-third of Frost's total poetic output employs fall or winter imagery. (Of only twenty-three spring or summer poems, eight have end-season overtones, and another four are concerned with mowing which may be considered analogous to the fall harvest.)²

Frost's most common device for using the seasons is an outer-inner weather metaphor. The outer, the seasons and their particular aspects, reflects the inner, man's psychological and spiritual state. The changes signified in fall and the struggles imaged in winter frequently find resolution in an ironic action or an epigrammatic decision. In "Will-

⁴ I wish to thank Professor William C. DeVane of Yale University for his kind aid and encouragement in the development of this paper.

¹ *Philosophy of Literary Form* (Baton Rouge, 1941), p. 20.

² Based on examination of *Complete Poems* (New York, 1949). All page references are to this volume.

ful Homing" winter, a blinding storm, sets the literal picture so typical in Frost:

It is getting dark and time he drew to a house,
But the blizzard blinds him to any house ahead. (p. 456)

Winter, darkness, blindness and the absence of any house blend with the picture of a man struggling, not only against the storm, but also against what the storm implies. The pivotal line of the poem is, "Since he means to come to a door he will come to a door." As the title suggests, the hardships of storms can be resolved by man's will—by the necessary sacrifice.

Brother Meserve in "Snow" also struggles against a storm. He, like every man, is concerned with survival, but Frost clearly implies two levels of encounter, one for the goal and the other for human understanding. He shows success in the first, but gives no promise of success in the second struggle. Frost's elemental choice poem, "The Road Not Taken," is set "in a yellow wood." It was autumn, the time of change, the time leading to winter and the long days of hardship.

The predominant Frostian tone is a cautious transcendentalism and a Puritanic stoicism. The sacramental quality of fall typically expresses the transcendentalism, and the bleakness of winter conveys the stoicism. When Frost wants to get away from these concepts, he uses images from other seasons. Spring and summer in Frost repeatedly signify the transient, the unreal, as in "To Earthward," where the summer and summer things are "sweet as I could bear." But the realities of life are harsh: "Now no joy but lacks salt." In "Nothing Gold Can Stay" the spring imagery expresses the ephemeral: "Nature's first green is gold, / Her hardest hue to hold." (p. 272)

Summer and spring poems sometimes even contain echoes of fall and winter. In "Hyla Brook" for example, "ghost of sleigh-bells in a ghost of snow" breaks in like a macabre death image in a Donne poem.

The fall, especially in the falling of the leaves, reflects rebirth, a dying that creates. Here is this thought in "In Hardwood Groves":

Before the leaves can mount again
To fill the trees with another shade
They must go down past things coming up
They must go down into the dark decayed. (p. 37)

The storm-death symbolism of "The Onset" reveals an unusual use of winter for rebirth imagery:

Always the same, when on a fated night
At last the gathered snow lets down as white
As may be in dark woods. . . . (p. 278)

The snow apparently symbolizes death, but a death that will see a spring: "I know that winter death has never tried / The earth but it has failed. . . ." "Winter death" is the only kind of death man knows *a posteriori*, which will fail. But here, as in "In Hardwood Groves" ("However it is in some other world / I know that this is the way in ours."), Frost indicates a concern with the supernatural as he reflects on the natural. His hope is for a "winter death," a death that comes in white. That hope, he says, is with us all year when "Nothing will be left white but here a birch / And there a clump of houses with a church."

The Frostian hero is one who struggles alone—alone, that is, except for God as in "Bereft." Frost seems principally a poet of the cold passions. There is not the warmth of an embrace in his poetry so much as the chilled dread of loss, or of the restrained devotion that whelms up at a parting as in "Good-Bye and Keep Cold." His moving dramatic pieces, "Home Burial," "Death of the Hired Man," "The Witch of Coos," and "A Servant to Servants," are about winter in the mind and heart. And usually, as in "Death of the Hired Man," winter, age, failure, loneliness, and often death unite in a wholeness of tone.

More than any other single aspect, fall and winter imagery seems to reflect the central emphasis of Frost's poetry. These seasons also provide the conceptual equivalents which so often convey an immediate sense of "understanding" to even the casual reader. The significance of snow in the poem "Dust in My Eyes" suggests something of this relationship between the end-seasons and the thought of Frost:

If, as they say, some dust thrown in my eyes
Will keep my talk from getting overwise,
I'm not the one for putting off the proof.
Let it be overwhelming, off a roof
And around a corner, blizzard snow for dust,
And blind me to a standstill if it must.

University of Connecticut

WILLIAM T. MOYNIHAN

Again the "Je Ne Sais Quoi"

Lanson too hastily dismissed Gombault's discourse on the "Je ne sais quoi," delivered before the Académie Française at its inception. Now the "Je ne sais quoi" figures more and more prominently in modern reappraisals of seventeenth-century literature, and has come to play an essential role, for example, in what Professor Borgerhoff calls *The Freedom of French Classicism*.

The term had a widespread vogue in the seventeenth century, but remained elusive. Père Bouhours made the most serious attempt to grapple with it, but ended up by declaring it a mystery, or a secret. The two interlocutors in his dialogue,¹ Ariste and Eugène, discern the "Je ne sais quoi" all around them in the world. It alone determines whether a person pleases or not, whether there is born in us a feeling of sympathy or antipathy. It brings it about that one human being, possessing all the presumed requisites of success, inspires in us a feeling of repulsion, and that another, marked from all appearances to meet with disfavor, will attract us intensely. There are no rules to be studied or applied. The "Je ne sais quoi" exerts a secret and delicate influence, irrespective of time, place, and person, and is felt not only in the case of personal relationships; Nature, Religion, and Art also have to submit to it. We feel it, but we do not know why. Ariste and Eugène can state only one thing categorically: the "Je ne sais quoi" escapes rational definition. They are dealing with something which, as they put it, subsists only because of our inability to understand or explain it.

The term was taken for granted, and after Bouhours few came to grips with it directly. Reference is made sometimes to Montesquieu and Marivaux. The former remarks that "il y a quelque fois dans les personnes ou dans les choses un charme invisible, une grâce naturelle, qu'on n'a pu définir, et qu'on a été forcé d'appeler le 'Je ne sais quoi.' Il me semble que c'est un effet principalement fondé sur la surprise" (*Essai sur le goût*).² While he deals essentially with the same mystery, his exposition is much briefer and his thoughts not as penetrating. Marivaux offers a charming parable of two gardens, one the abode of Beauty and the other of the "Je ne sais quoi." Only

¹ *Les Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène* (1671). See *Entretien V*: "Le Je Ne Sais Quoi."

² Montesquieu's *Essai sur le goût* was published after his death. It had been destined for the *Encyclopédie*. The quotation here can be found in E. Laboulaye's ed. of the *Œuvres complètes de Montesquieu*, VII, 133.

the latter can lay claim to real beauty; it alone is the proper shelter for all the graces. The visitor, enthralled by what he sees, senses this but cannot understand it. It is the "Je ne sais quoi" finally who enlightens us, or rather adds to the mystery:

Ne me cherchez point sous une forme, j'en ai mille, et pas une de fixe: voilà pourquoi on me voit sans me connaître, sans pouvoir ni me saisir, ni me définir: on me perd de vue en me voyant; on me sent, on ne me démêle pas; enfin vous me voyez, et vous me cherchez, et vous ne me trouverez jamais autrement; aussi ne serez-vous jamais las de me voir.³

There is another author of the first half of the eighteenth century who dealt with this intangible, invisible, mysteriously fluid image. His contribution has remained unnoticed by the scholars of today. Louis de Boissy, one of those writers Lenient so aptly called "Les Ephémères: oubliés ou dédaignés,"⁴ produced a play in 1731 entitled *Le Je ne sais quoi; comédie en un acte avec un divertissement*. It did have fourteen consecutive performances, met with success, and was said to be "très jolie." It was then forgotten.⁵

Boissy presents us with a "Je ne sais quoi" in flesh and bone. We are even informed of his ancestry and destiny! The Je Ne Sais Quoi, or Arlequin (played by Dominique Biancolelli of the Théâtre des Italiens) ends up as a member in good standing of Momus' famous Regiment or gay Order of the Calotins. This is considered to be the only fitting place for it—or him. But except for this "shocking" ending (perhaps less so in the early eighteenth century, for there were, after all, quite a few rather famous members in the Calotte circle) what Boissy had to say about the "Je ne sais quoi" cannot be considered nonsensical or farcical.

Je Ne Sais Quoi, disgusted with the artificiality of life in Paris, has retired to the desert, there, no doubt, the better to give vent to his misanthropy. Momus, Appolon, and Vénus have come to lead him back to the city. One learns that Je Ne Sais Quoi "a les traits peu réguliers; mais fins . . . / Il est brun de visage et petit de figure"; he was born "de la plus charmante des Grâces" and of "Caprice"

³ *Le Cabinet du philosophe; deuxième feuille* (1734), in *Œuvres complètes*, Duchesne, 1781, ix, 565-66.

⁴ *La Comédie en France au XVIII^e siècle*, Hachette, 1888, II, ch. 1.

⁵ There exists an older study on Boissy by Charles F. Zeek, Jr., *Louis de Boissy, auteur comique (1694-1758)* (Grenoble: Allier Frères, 1914). Dr. Zeek was only concerned with Boissy as a playwright. He simply quotes Gustave Larroumet to the effect that Bouhours and Marivaux had also dealt with the "Je ne sais quoi."

[Scene I]. Boissy is trying very hard to sound funny. At best this is gibberish. But the same is not true of what follows. All are agreed that since the flight of Je Ne Sais Quoi everything in life languishes: Folly is not the same any more, nor is Poetry, Tragedy, Beauty, Art, Love, etc. Momus draws a panegyristic picture of the absent hero and, foreshadowing the ending of the play, states that only those who belong to his Regiment of Calotins can hope to escape the mortal enemies of Je Ne Sais Quoi: "Affectation, Fard, Clinquant, Faste." Vénus and Appolon will be incapable of persuading Je Ne Sais Quoi to return to Paris, only a "joyeux Calotin" will succeed. After all, says Momus, "On plaît moins par le sérieux, / Qu'on ne fait par le Badinage: / Et le Je Sais Quoi, si charmant à nos yeux, / Est lui-même porté vers le Calotinage, / Et tient de lui ses traits les plus victorieux" [Scene II]. Momus' prophecy is fulfilled. Vénus is rebuked: "Quelle affectation! Quel rouge épouvantable!" Appolon fares no better: "Madame n'est plus qu'une vieille coquette . . . Vous êtes, vous, un Esprit guindé." Both are told to leave and to strive for simplicity [Scene III]. This advice could come straight from Boileau.

There arrive now, in quick succession, a host of characters supposedly aspiring to be the friends of Je Ne Sais Quoi, but all, in reality, his sworn enemies. The "Géomètre" is first. He comes along pontificating that "L'exacte Vérité, la solide Raison, / Ont seul droit de plaire, / Tout le reste n'est qu'un jargon." One cannot sense the Je Ne Sais Quoi, he claims; it has to be demonstrated geometrically. That being impossible, he has no choice but to doubt its existence. Does Boissy have Descartes in mind here? Is he to be opposed to the poets, the seers who alone can appreciate the "Je ne sais quoi"?⁶ At any rate this "Géomètre" leaves the stage muttering: "Mes yeux sont convaincus, mais non pas mon Esprit" [Scene IV]. He might have pondered Descartes's advice: "Habet enim humana mens nescio quid divini, in quo prima cogitationum utilium semina ita jacta sunt, ut saepe, quantumvis neglecta et transversis studiis, suffocata, spontaneam frugem producant."⁷

⁶ The danger of making Descartes responsible for the view that classicism only worshipped reason did eventually materialize. R. Michéa has clearly shown the misconception that existed for so long about what was supposed to pass as Cartesianism. Cf. "Les Variations de la raison au XVII^e siècle," *RPF*, Sept.-Oct. 1938, pp. 183-201. For some examples of the usage of the term "Je ne sais quoi" by Descartes, cf. his *Méditation seconde*; *Méditation sixième*; *Lettre à Beeckman*, 26 March, 1619.

⁷ *Regulae ad Directionem Ingenii, Regula IV*: "Necessaria est Methodus ad

A "Petit Maître," ambassador of Love, is the next one to be rebuked. Claiming to be literally impregnated by the gifts of Je Ne Sais Quoi, he is rudely reminded that the only gifts of importance are those "qui sont marquez au coin de la nature." His chances are not enhanced when he is joined, for the sake of contrast, by an "Officier Suisse" speaking with a heavy Germanic accent and smelling of alcohol. He is dispatched by "Li Tieu qui préside à la Tonne, / Monsir Pacchus." Boissy is repeating familiar views about the Germans: a nation of heavy drinkers and eaters, full of brute strength and utterly devoid of *savoir vivre*. Je Ne Sais Quoi dismisses both, the one for being too vulgar, the other for being too affected [Scenes V & VI].

No greater luck is encountered by the "Public Féminin." Says Je Ne Sais Quoi: "Rapprochez-vous du Naturel, Madame, / Qui peut lui seul vous embellir; / A cet Instinct si sûr, laissez aller votre âme, / Il la saura mener droit au Plaisir." An "Acteur Français," terribly bombastic, shouting unnaturally "pour exciter en vous une noble terreur," is quickly sent on his way. He swears revenge and threatens dire things: "Pour première victime immoler le Bon Sens; / Et signalant mes coups par des débris illustres, / Poignarder le Souffleur et briser tous nos lustres." A musician and a dancer also fail in their attempt to seduce Je Ne Sais Quoi [Scenes VIII-XI].

Momus is now ready for his master stroke. He sends Silvia bearing the famous "Brevet," a commission in the Regiment of the Calotins. It is signed as follows:

Fait je ne sçai quel jour, à je ne sçai quelle heure,
 Dans je ne sçai quelle demeure,
 Par un Auteur du Régiment,
 Appelé je ne sçai comment.

The invitation is accepted, Silvia's charms are irresistible: "J'irai par tout en votre compagnie / . . . Moi je serai Je Ne Sçai Quoi, / Et vous serez Je Ne Sçai Qu'est-ce" [Scene XII]. To end the play Boissy adds a last scene where "le théâtre change et représente une salle ornée de tout ce qui peut caractériser la Folie et l'Agrément, réunis ensemble." Arlequin and Silvia make their triumphal entry and all the Calotins sing and dance as the curtain goes down.

As a comedy this play does not have much to commend it, relying as it does on the burlesque or slap-stick situations. Its well-deserved

rerum veritatem investigandam." *Œuvres de Descartes*, ed. Ch. Adam and P. Tannery, x, 373.

oblivion has not impoverished the world of the theater. But it bears witness to the importance of the indefinable "Je ne sais quoi." It is true that Boissy went no further than others in solving the famous riddle. It is true also that one could detect in the play a certain irreverence toward the whole question. Bouhours himself had tried to deal with his subject in an easy going and witty manner; throughout his *Entretien*, however, one can feel that he was fully aware of the serious implications of his reflections. That conviction is not so strong with Boissy's work. And yet, in spite of his flippancy, every page, almost, dwells on simplicity, naturalness, good taste. One can hear echoes from the seventeenth century, out of some "Art poétique" or "Traité des agréments." The public was reminded—sixty years after Bouhours—that the "Je ne sais quoi" was a *sine qua non* in every phase of life or art. The spectators were expected to chuckle at the various fools presented, who were fools precisely because they did not comprehend the power, the magic of that indispensable spark. After Bouhours, who had used the dialogue form, Boissy tried something new, and enacted the Je Ne Sais Quoi, giving it graphic, visible, though humorous embodiment on the stage. Although the play hardly deserves mention in the history of the drama, it deserves notice in the story of the "Je ne sais quoi."

The Johns Hopkins University

WOLFGANG E. THORMANN

The Informant and the Adverb

Twice before (*MLN*, LXXI, 362-73; *Hispania*, XL, 326-9) I have had occasion to check the results of statistical studies on Spanish word order, only to find that the claims of "zero-occurrence" were unfounded. In this paper I shall criticize a non-statistical but equally mechanical study in the same field, analyzing in detail the definitive statements about post-position of the adverb offered by Dr. Ralph Dale McWilliams in "The Adverb in Colloquial Spanish" (one of five articles published by the University of Illinois Press, 1954, and edited by Henry R. Kahane and Angelina Pietrangeli, under the title *Descriptive Studies in Spanish Grammar*).¹

¹ This volume has already been severely criticized by Professor Bull (*Lang.* 31, 563-72). In regard to Mr. McWilliams' study, he shows great scepticism as to both method and results; he does not, however, treat in detail the

Mr. McWilliams begins his treatment of word order² by setting up two main classes of adverbial expressions: Adverb One, which follows the verb, and Adverb Two, which is free to precede or follow.³ Five factors, we are told, play their part in determining word order: the form, function and meaning of the adverb; the number of elements of the sentence; intonation.⁴ Thus, for example, such a sentence as *toca el piano maravillosamente* illustrates the fact that adverbs in *-mente* are fixed in post-position by their form. If we find the reverse word order in *Verdaderamente no lo creo*, where the adverb has the function of modifying the sentence as a whole, this means that the causative factor of Form, which worked with . . . *maravillosamente*, is now superseded by another causal factor, that of Function. (Similarly, Form may give way to Meaning; Form, Meaning and Function, to Number of Elements, and all of them to Intonation.)

But surely the reader has sensed the specious logic underlying Mr. McWilliam's assumptions. If we find adverbs of exactly the same form in *toca el piano maravillosamente* and *verdaderamente no lo creo*, the second sentence is absolute proof that the post-position in the first case is not caused by form: of the two factors mentioned, form and function, it could be only the latter which, in both cases, has determined position. By the same kind of reasoning used by the author one could argue: "Objects that are round (e.g. balloons) float in the air because of their shape; if round objects are also found on the ground, or in bureau-drawers, this is a sign that the causative factor of Form has been superseded by some other factor: for instance, Gravity."

Let us then dismiss from consideration the "five-fold system of causal criteria" offered by Mr. McWilliams, to examine simply the factual results he has obtained. Limiting ourselves only to those of

definitive statements offered, nor does he attempt, as I shall, to "disprove" them: he bases his scepticism on the scepticism of informants whom he has consulted.

² It is only in Part II that the position of the adverb is discussed: Part I is devoted to a curiously elaborate and irrelevant description of adverbial forms: more than 100 formal distinctions are established, most of which are never taken up again in the section on word order.

³ The reader immediately wonders: what about "Adverb Three" (which would precede the verb)? No such class is set up by the author.

He does, however, point out five heterogeneous adverbial types or groups which always precede (5.121; 5.131; 6.4; 6.5; 6.7), plus two which usually precede (5.122.1 and 5.122.2).

⁴ By 'intonation' Mr. McWilliams means to refer only to that of commands, exclamations and questions; within a declarative statement, apparently, intonation does not enter as a factor determining word order.

his statements which supposedly admit of no exceptions, we find the following eight definitive categories:

A. All adverbial expressions of the following forms follow the verb in statements,⁵ unless they have the function of sentence-adverbs, or unless their meaning is that of time or place:

5.111.1 The final morpheme is *-mente*.

5.111.2 The final morpheme is the same as the ending of the masculine singular of the corresponding adjective: *Cuchichea bajo*.

5.111.3 The final morpheme is the inflected ending of the corresponding adjective: *Maria vive tranquila*.

5.112 All adverbial phrases introduced by *a, con, de, por, sin, hacia, hasta*.

5.122.2b The five deictic adverbs *aquí, acá, allí, allá, ahí* when compounded (*aquí arriba*, etc.).

B. All adverbial expressions, without exception, follow the verb in statements if they perform the following functions:

6.2 The adverb serves as object: *Hablamos de Juan; andan por la otra orilla, vengo de muy abajo, viene tras de mí, vas a todas partes*.⁶

6.6 The adverb serves as part of the action: *sácala de aquí, lo puse entre las hojas del libro, lo dejé en el sol*.⁷

C. 8.1 All single adverbs and adverbial phrases in binary statements appear in post-position only.

Unfortunately, the factual observations of Mr. McWilliams are as little reliable as was his theoretical construction; exceptions can be found to all eight types:⁸

⁵ The limitation to "[declarative] statements" throughout is a reminder of the fact that, according to the author, exceptions may occur e.g. in exclamations: one may say *¡Por dinero no me vendo!* but not, apparently, *por grados a todo se llega*.

⁶ According to the author, the adverb may serve as object not only in *Hablamos de Juan*, but also with intransitive verbs of movement modified by adverbs of place.

⁷ For "adverb as part of the action" the author offers the following definition "the action always expresses some kind of motion and the adverb some kind of place required by the motion" (this type differs from the "object adverb" in that the verb is always transitive).

⁸ These eight types exhaust all those of the post-positional definitive categories which might be called "systematic." One may, however, mention two other, "accidental" types: though (1) adverbs of time and place, and (2) adverbial clauses usually enjoy free distribution, there are two individual adverbs of time which supposedly always follow the verb (*tarde* and *temprano*), and four kinds of clauses: those introduced by *que* 'because,' by *porque*, by *como* (except when meaning 'if'), and by *como si*.

It may be stated herewith that it is quite possible for *tarde* and *temprano* to precede the verb (to say nothing of *más tarde* and *tarde o temprano*):

Tardecillo vino usted anoche: F 113.

Temprano han empezado las visitas: CE 142 / ¿Sabes si llegaron las latas de

5.111.1 *Modestamente* confieso que es lo que prefiero: *HTe* 155.*

5.111.2 Bien claro se ve que . . . : *O* 118 / *Harto* sabe usted que . . . : *O* 124 / . . . y tanto se entusiasmó el hombre que . . . : *HTe* 143 / Y bastante le habrá pesado a usted: *CE* 204 / Te veo venir. Igual empezamos todos los años: *LQ* 274.

5.111.3 Juntos afrontaremos lo que sea: *LQ* 100 / Juntos hemos crecido . . . , juntos hemos reído: *CE* 119.

Hija, muy *distraidita* va usted: *FJ* 113 / Sí señora. Muy *atrebuliádica* viene usted: *O* 99.

5.112 *CON*: Con usted debe ser muy difícil el romanticismo: *T* 169.

¿Más grandes? Con ésta se puede degoller a un buey: *LQ* 149 / Con eso se dormirá: *LQV* 79.

Con que, con pena lo digo, y sin pensamiento de ofenderle . . . : *O* 112.

Con esa duda me casé y con esa duda sigo: *LQ* 328.

A: Tengo que estar sola . . . A la fuerza se me debe notar: *M* 193 / Bien a pesar mío lo nombro: *CE* 66 / No quería ni a empujones hacerlo: *G* 189.

¡Ya hablaremos de ello!—A eso vengo: *T* 60 / Pero me estabas hablando del novio . . . —A eso voy: *LQ* 88.

DE: Pero esto *de* algo te ha de servir: *LA* 48 / Pero muchas veces *de* nada sirve la voluntad de los hombres: *CE* 189.

Ni *de* encargo encuentro una ocasión como ésta: *CE* 189.

Pero no os levantéis . . . —De rodillas debíamos ponernos, señorita: *O* 102.

POR: Por eso me puede más lo que dice: *LQV* 70.

Yo por nada del mundo quería que vinieran: *T* 94.

petroleo? — Por la mañana, *bien temprano*, llegaron: *LQV* 17 / ¿También se ha levantado? — Ya lo creo. *Muy temprano* salió a misa: *H* 7.

*The abbreviations of the texts used are as follows:

- A* *Teatro completo* of Carlos Arniches, vol. II, Madrid, 1948.
C *Canción de cuna*, by G. Martínez Sierra, Madrid, 1915.
CE *Comedias escogidas*, by S. and A. Álvarez Quintero, Madrid, 1910.
F *Fortunata y Jacinta*, vol. 3, by B. Pérez Galdós, Madrid, 1887.
G *Galdós*, by Luis Antón del Olnei and Arturo García Carrafea, Madrid, 1912.
H *El héroe*, by Gustavo Sánchez Galarraga, New York, 1941.
HTa *Historia de una taverna*, by A. Díaz Cañabate, Buenos Aires, 1947.
HTe *Historia de una tertulia*, by A. Díaz Cañabate, Valencia, 1952.
L *La loca de la casa*, by B. Pérez Galdós, New York, 1924.
LA *Los de abajo*, by Mariano Azuela, New York, 1939.
LQ *Lo que se habla por ahí*, by A. Díaz Cañabate, Madrid, 1953.
LQV *Los que vuelven*, by Juan Bustillo Oro (*Tres Dramas Mexicanos*), Madrid, 1933.
LR *La familia de León Roch*, by B. Pérez Galdós, vol. I, Madrid, 1908.
M *Mariana Rebull*, by Ignacio Agustí, Barcelona, 1953.
N *De la noche a la mañana*, by Uguarte and López Rubio, New York, 1934.
O *Die Hervorhebung im Spanischen*, diss. Zürich, 1951, by Hans Oster.
P *Pigmalion 1950*, by Noel Clarasó, Barcelona, 1953.
PD *La familia de Pascual Duarte*, by Camilo José Cela, Barcelona, 1951.
Q *Teatro completo* of S. and J. Álvarez Quintero, vol. 26, Madrid, 1928.
T *Teatro español 1951-52*, ed. F. C. Sainz de Robles, Madrid, 1953.

Por algo no me halla nunca aquí: LQV 25 / Por algo dicen que . . . : LQ 99.
. . . y por poquito nos queamos carväs las dos: CE 124.

Se lo digo por respeto, no por ofensa. — Por ofensa te lo voy a tomar:
LQV 21.

SIN: Sin gota de sangre vengo, don Miguel de mis culpas: CE 71.

Sin un poco de felicidad . . . no se puede ser bueno: NN 45.

Parece que sin ellos me falta algo: CE 108 / Ni con sonajero ni sin él se va
a callar: CE 108.

HASTA: Hasta la puerta misma vino haciéndonos cortesía: G 89.

HACIA: Ya se lo llevaron, para mandarlo a su país. Hacia la frontera
salieron muchos coches cargados de mexicanos como él: LQV 54.

5.122.2b ¿Y la Rosario? — Ahí dentro está: PD 182 / Ahí cerca se nos estro-
peó el coche: N 14.

6.2 (a) Aquí tienes, patroncito . . . — De eso hablaba con Chema. No me
gusta . . . eso de patrón: LQV 21 / Déjalo junto a la ventanilla. — En eso
estaba pensando: LQ 190 / Y además, te ha salvado la vida, que de eso no te
acuerdas: LQ 83 / . . . en nada repara: P 128 / a todo atiende: CE 49 / De eso
me encargo yo: T 77.

¿Como abusan de mi pobre cuñado! Conmigo habían de dar: O 103 / . . . que
no digo yo con condes, con emperadores se casaría: O 102.

(b) Nosotros . . . queríamos . . . irnos con él. Para México . . . — Bueno,
para México van: LQV 65 / Tu disfrutas de lo que ganas, pero una dale que
le das ocho horitas y ni al cine puede ir: LQ 298.

Fijaros en esas que entran. A esta taberna viene muy buena gente: LQ 100.

¿Y mi hermana? — A su cuarto se retiró hace un ratillo: O 98.

Todo lo bueno que viene a mí, del campo viene: O 104.

¿Pero y la cárcel? — De la cárcel se sale: A 707.

6.6 ¿Al Sur de todos modos? ¿A fuerza al Sur? — Para allá nos mandan:
LQV 36.

Hambre . . . por esos lados . . . A eso los llevó su . . . ambición: LQV 31.

En menudo lío te ha puesto . . . ese tal don Miguel: O 133.

Yo no debo rebajarme en solicitar tales favores . . . A tu cargo lo dejo:
. O 103.

No, querido Valdivia, de esta [tertulia] no te echaremos nunca: HTe 218.

8.1 [See the 20 examples of binaries with preceding adverb quoted above.]

To judge by the examples just quoted, there are two main reasons
for the ante-position of these adverbs that were supposedly fixed in
post-position: either we have to do with emotional word-order (as in
the wistful sigh: *y ni al cine puede ir*), or else the adverb is used in
an introductory rather than a determining function: *A este taberna
viene muy buena gente*. Mr. McWilliams has obviously taken no
account of emotional word-order (in declarative statements); as for

the introductory type, it would seem that he assumed too quickly that he had managed to exclude all cases by the (mainly formal) limitations he imposed.

But what of his material: the objective evidence that is always there as a check on the scholar's careless statements, as a cure for his ignorance and his prejudices? The counter-examples I have assembled above are the result of a very superficial examination of 20 texts; Mr. McWilliams also read 20 texts: what has happened to the counter-examples that he *must* have found? To judge by the one play in his list which I have read (*Los que vuelven*), and which contains 11 exceptions to his theories (see citations from *LQV* in my examples), Mr. McWilliams would have found, and disregarded, 220 counter-examples! How did he dare disregard this evidence? The author's justification is evidently contained in the brief statement (0.3: *Method*): "All items which seemed not natural to the informant were eliminated."¹⁰

* * * * *

The apotheosis of the Informant! From field-work on dialects and aboriginal languages (where he is necessary), and from investigation into phonology, morphology and basic lexicology (where he is mainly reliable, since, mainly, he has no choice), the informant has been brought into research on syntax, with its network of choices—and the syntax of literary languages, with their wealth of documentary material: into a field, that is, where both his necessity and his reliability are questionable. The paradox of such a step should be evident: what we in syntax admire deeply and enviously in the native speaker of a foreign language is his spontaneity, his marvelous unconscious grasp of the varied resources of his language, as he responds to each situation in which he finds himself, making, always the perfect choice. And so, we wrench him from the life-situation, this guarantee of spontaneity, we destroy his creative unconsciousness, in which alone his mastery, his power of "choice" is rooted, and then we ask this cramped, self-conscious, uprooted person to perform for us, in a vacuum.

The informant is least dangerous (and utterly superfluous) when asked to illustrate routine constructions, though even then his offerings

¹⁰ It is evidently to this procedure of elimination of evidence that Professor Kahane is referring, with approval, on page ix of the Preface to our volume; he prefers, however, the term "verification"; in his own article of 1950 on the inversion of the subject (*Lang.* 26, 256) the word "checking" is used.

are apt to be marked by a certain inanity; he becomes acutely if subtly dangerous when encouraged to create "identical pairs" of examples;¹¹ when he is allowed to generalize about usage, he can only give inaccurate information;¹² and, finally, the "informed informant" runs the great risk of being hypnotized by the theories of his linguist. Yet Mr. McWilliams has not only allowed his informants' creations to constitute the greater part of his evidence; he has permitted this single individual to pass judgment on the language of 20 other native speakers; this informant whom he has indoctrinated has been allowed to eliminate the objective evidence of his texts. We can only explain this by assuming that, as a disciple of Professor Kahane, the author has adopted blindly the latter's anti-intellectual attitude that the book is not to be trusted.

Writing in 1950 (*op. cit.*, 236), the Kahanes state: "The language of even colloquial literature is often too artificial or too folksy to represent normal usage." No evidence is adduced in support of this pronouncement; they offer not a single example of the "unnatural Spanish" so often found in colloquial texts. But they have evidently convinced their disciple that any given sentence in the written language *may* be abnormal, that he dare not, by himself, trust a single

¹¹ It has been my experience that Position is closely connected with word material; and I am convinced that to juggle with word order by taking a given sentence uttered in one form (*por salir a recibirlo me caí*) and putting it in reverse (*me caí por salir a recibirlo*), one runs the very great risk of creating a baby monster. The majority of the examples cited by our author come in "twin-pairs" invented by his informant; nearly always, I have the suspicion that one of the two is phoney. I cannot, at the present time, "prove" the phoniness I suspect and it is because of the difficulty of such proof that I speak of the "subtle" danger of these concoctions.

In one case, however (an example involving the position not of the adverb, but of the direct object), I can claim that the single example of the inverted object offered by our author is impossible in at least one regard: *¡Todos sus bienes testó mi padre a mi favor!* This could only be (if at all) *todos sus bienes los testó . . . a . . .*: I have found that with verbs of 'disposing of' the object, we find *O + loV*, never *OV* (see *Word* 12.3, Monograph Series, pp. 28-30).

And I believe (though here I am guessing) that this unnatural sentence is a result of having turned another sentence inside out: on the same page, the reference to testation occurs again, this time in the form: *adv. + VSO*: *¡A mi favor testó mi padre todos sus bienes!* This, I believe, was the starting point; when the informant performed the operation of chopping off head and tail and reversing them, she forgot to stick in the redundant pronoun (just the opposite of the blunder of leaving the sponge inside the patient!).

I do not maintain, however, that *todos sus bienes los testó . . . a . . .* is possible (I have not found *testar* in my examples of *O + loV*); I submit only that *todos sus bienes testó . . . a . . .* is impossible.

¹² One may remember the informants (see *Hispania* 40, 326) who swore that an unmodified subject could not precede the verb, thereby excluding from the Spanish language *dinero sobra ahora* or *oportunidades no le faltan*.

example that he reads: the informant must decide, the informed informant must become the prescriptive grammarian.

In this application of the Kahane method to syntax, two very terrible things happen. Not only do the last vestiges of disinterested scholarly inquiry vanish, but the linguist cuts himself off from his fellows: he has renounced all responsibility for the contents of his texts which alone constitute evidence accessible to all other scholars. Rational argument is impossible unless both disputants appeal to the same kind of evidence; and probably I have failed to convince Mr. McWilliams that his informant is unreliable, since I have appealed to evidence which he has already thrown out as invalid.

What is called for is to prove that the informant has been hypnotized by showing that when not under the spell of her linguist she breaks his rules—and “talks like the books” (whereby the validity of textual evidence would be if not “proven,” surely corroborated). But, short of seeking out the informant with a concealed tape-recorder, how could we do this? Surely no contradictions will be found in the text offered us by the author: we can hardly imagine that, under the heading “phrases with *por* follow the verb” there will appear phrases with *por* that precede the verb!

But the reader may remember (note 2) that the section devoted to word order was preceded by an Introduction concerned exclusively with details of form. Most of these distinctions are never heard of again; could it not then happen that under such a heading as “Modifiers of the head noun in adverbial phrases” (or “diminutive endings” or “tenses of the verb” etc.), where there is nothing to remind the informant of the theories of her linguist, she might find herself using natural word order, or relaxing her protective censorship?

This happens four times with *por*:

- 1.231 “The ending is -ito.” *Por* poquito me machuca un coche.
- 2.122.11 “The possessive precedes the head.” *Por* culpa de mi tía no fuf al baile.
- 2.131.3 “The action is in the preterite.” *Por* eso le pregunté a usted . . . si . . .¹³

¹³ The fourth case of *por* preceding the verb is found in Part II: “si yo no hubiese sido maderista por ideas, *hasta por* estética lo habría sido.”

It is simple to explain this nodding of the censor, even in the section on word order, for here (5.222: “Clause precedes phrase”), the point in question was merely the relative position of clause and phrase. The author was so busy showing that the simpler element was always closer to the verb, that he and his informant forgot to notice that this simpler element, here in ante-

It happens once with *con* (2.122.12: "the possessive follows the head"): *con permiso de ustedes, me voy ya*; it happens twice with *de*, under similarly irrelevant headings: *De mil amores te estoy ayudando* (2.112.12); *De algo tenemos que morirnos* (3.1); it happens eight times with compounds of *aquí* etc.:

1.234 Allá lejitos veo una luz

1.5 *Acá dentro* no hace frío / *allá fuera* están jugando los niños / *Allí abajo* está el sótano / *allí abajo* los rechazamos entre dos / *allí arriba* está mi mamá / *aquí afuera* se siente mucho fresco / *aquí enfrente* vive mi tía.

It is, however, in the treatment of binaries that the true nature of the informant reveals itself most appealingly; my favorite, in spite of the monotony of theme involved, is the quatrain of 1.5 (where again, incidentally, we find compounds of *aquí*):

1.23 A poquito volverá / de repentito dejó de venir / igualito me lo dijo.

1.232 Oritita mismo se la llevó / Arribita lo puse.

1.233 De veritas te lo dije.

1.5 Aquí encima lo puse / ahí encima lo deje / allá encima lo colgué / aquí arriba lo puse.

2.11 Ven, desde aquí te veo.

2.122.12 En presencia tuya la rechacé.

2.131.2 Hace un momento la defendías.

2.14 En dos por tres nos entendimos.

2.212.1 Dos horas ha dictado / Una que otra noche voy a visitarla / Multitud de veces te lo he dicho / Más de media hora le he estado aconsejando.

2.224 Toda la vida lo ha querido.

2.231 Día a día he ido mejorando.

7.1 Todos los días me baño / Antes no me gustaba.

7.2 En la mera maceta ('head') se la sorrajé ('hit').

Later, the informant will corroborate the author in what is, perhaps, the strangest statement ever uttered about an adverb: "The single adverb and the adverbial phrase in [binary] statements, appear in post-position only" (8.1). But here, as we hear the un hypnotized Trilby chattering happily: "Aquí encima lo puse; todos los días me baño," we can only rejoice at the vindication of the old, wise saying: *Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurrit*.

* * * * *

position, contained *por*! It is so difficult to think of two (or three) things at once.

Incidentally, even here the author is quite wrong; the following sentence is an excellent counter-example to his dictum that "the single adverb is closer to the head ['verb'] than the adverbial phrase, which, in turn, is closer to the head than the adverbial clause": "Y luego, poco a poco, cuando va yegando la luz *dér día*, se van distinguiendo los colores de . . ." : CE 283.

Rational argument is possible only when both disputants appeal to the same kind of evidence; I have now appealed to the very source of evidence used by Mr. McWilliams, and the informant from Oaxocoa stands accused, by her own words, of grievous unreliability. But the guilt, of course, falls upon the author, who has presented to a scholarly public the results of an unscholarly credulity. It falls also, and more heavily, upon those who edited the author's study and whose method inspired it.¹⁴

The article itself is not important; more important is the method that inspired it. But most important is the present linguistic situation that could inspire such a method. We must expect many more such desperate, inorganic, pseudo-scientific constructions, so long as the ambitious scholar in syntax refuses to face the basic problem in this field, which is the systematic relationship between form and meaning—a relationship which can be studied only in the Book (in many, many books), since there alone do we find Context,¹⁵ without which, Meaning is inconceivable.

The Johns Hopkins University

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

REVIEWS

Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse: A Modern Reconstruction in Text and Scale Drawings* (New York: Scribner's, 1956. xxiii + 240 pp. \$7.00). THIS book contains much that is good common sense and much that is the result of shrewd deliberation and wide reading, but in this review I must concentrate on the faults of the book, for it seems to me that they are basic to its conception and writing. Nothing I can say will belittle the help it will give to those who want to see, in very general terms, what an Elizabethan theatre

¹⁴ Mr. McWilliams' aprioristic five-fold system is obviously based upon the six-fold system offered by the Kahanes in their article quoted above.

¹⁵ Or rather: "Context in rich variety"; as for context alone, this would be guaranteed by evidence from tape-recordings.

But so long as privacy is granted us in our civilization, conversations of intimacy and deep seriousness are not apt to get recorded. The novelist and dramatist may enter where the field-worker cannot; they may even penetrate into the secret chambers of the mind.

might have looked like, or to such model builders as may wish to make replicas of this hypothetical structure; but I must point out that its title 'Shakespeare's Globe Playhouse; a modern reconstruction' may trap the unwary into thinking that it describes an actual theatre, the theatre in which some of Shakespeare's plays were performed for the first time. The important words in the title are 'a modern reconstruction,' but untutored eyes may well miss their significance, carried away by photographs and scale-plans and measurements which appear so definite. The crux of the matter is that I cannot understand how Mr. Smith can have allowed his book to take on such a seemingly definitive air; I think it is a dangerous book.

To be sure a model builder needs definite measurements to work on, but they could have been provided at the end of the book, for the drawings only. It would seem that Mr. Smith had an unconscious desire to be more definite than the facts permit and that this has been allowed to distort his presentation of evidence as his argument develops. At the beginning he makes it quite clear that the measurements he offers are based on the idea that an almost invariable use would have been made of a twelve foot building unit or module; this idea is put forward properly and tentatively at first, but later the doubts are suppressed, or forgotten, as the reconstruction is elaborated (cf. pp. 88-90).

But it is not only in giving measurements that Mr. Smith seems inclined to be more definite than the evidence warrants. In his first description of the vignettes depicting theatres on the title-pages of *Roxana* and *Messallina*, he very properly points out that the *Messallina* one is dependant on the *Roxana*, and that *Roxana* was a Latin play performed at the University of Cambridge, and hence that the two vignettes are really only one piece of evidence about what might well be an academic, and not a public, theatre. So far very good, but later all this is forgotten, and the two pictures are used as two separate pieces of evidence about public theatres, to help turn the balance against other conflicting evidence (cf. p. 67).

When Mr. Smith uses evidence from plays first performed at other theatres than the Globe to support his 'modern reconstruction' of that particular theatre, he does usually acknowledge the fact,¹ but, in general, he makes insufficient allowance for the experimental and developing nature of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama; he tries to

¹ Sometimes he fails to do so, as at p. 123, and once, at p. 75, he quotes 'certain other scenes' without any specification of their authority.

enunciate 'rules' for stage management and implies a kind of orthodoxy in the practices of different theatres. If one generalization may be hazarded about Elizabethan theatres it is surely that they were run by a rapidly developing, experimenting, fashion-ridden, competitive group of artists and not by sober-minded workmen evolving and manipulating a standard machine; the variety in modes of dialogue or characterization within the plays of any one year, or company, or author, should be sufficient to testify to this, even if one's personal knowledge of active and innovating artists working today did not impel one to presume that it was equally true for any earlier group of such artists, even when they were called, technically, rogues and vagabonds. In seeking general 'rules' and mixing evidence taken from plays performed over a period of twenty or more years, Mr Smith has not made proper allowance for these facts; his attitude to the evidence is not in tune with them.

Mr. Smith's book is also dangerous in some of its presuppositions. I was first of all worried about this in his preface, where he seems to imply that 'continuous' staging of Shakespeare, or uncut versions of his plays, are not possible on a picture-frame stage (cf. p. xii). Possibly this only betrays a prejudice in favour of 'Elizabethan' staging, but this sort of thing becomes more serious when dealing with 'Elizabethan' concepts of realism on the stage. This may be illustrated by the fact that when Mr. Smith is considering the structure and management of his theatre he never seems to consider, seriously, how easily an 'interior' scene could have been performed on the main stage without using either an upper stage or the stage space to the rear of the curtains on the main stage (cf. pp. 106-17 and 131-2); can it be that he has never seen a performance of a play in which actors have brought a throne or a table and chairs on to the main stage in full view of the audience, or, if he has, can it be that this destroyed, for him, some sort of dramatic illusion? If his experience as a member of an audience is as slight as these presuppositions suggest, Mr. Smith should have been doubly diffident in arguing how action was managed on an Elizabethan stage.

Another dangerous presupposition is Mr. Smith's belief that the origin of Elizabethan theatres was the inn yard *rather than* medieval stages; Mr. Smith does mention the notion that there may have been some medieval influence but he does not give it full recognition in elaborating his theories of stage structure and management. Again George Kernodle's *From Art to Theatre* is in Mr. Smith's bibliography

but he seems to have been unimpressed, for it is not referred to in the text at all, and Kernodle's discussion of the development of Elizabethan theatres inside a Renaissance pictorial tradition is never used for Mr. Smith's 'modern reconstruction' of the Globe.

Any reader familiar with the work of Reynolds, Hodges, Southern, and Hosley (as Mr. Smith says he is) will know at once the meticulous selection of evidence and the wary reasoning which are necessary before advancing any hypothesis about specific Elizabethan or Jacobean theatres and managements. With such examples before him I cannot understand how Mr. Smith allowed himself to write this book in the form which he has chosen. If a general picture of 'an Elizabethan theatre' was required, with exact plans for model builders, it could have been done far more simply, at much less expense, and in a way which would not have given the impression of certainty about a particular theatre, and would not have retarded or obscured in popular estimation the work of more rigorous researchers.

The University of Birmingham

JOHN RUSSELL BROWN

Andrew Hilen, ed., *The Diary of Clara Crowninshield: A European Tour with Longfellow, 1835-36* (Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press, 1956, 298 pp. \$5.00). CLARA Crowninshield, the illegitimate daughter of a picturesque yachtsman and privateer of the early days of the 19th Century, was a schoolmate and intimate friend of Longfellow's first wife, Mary Potter. When Longfellow entered upon his second European journey, Miss Crowninshield went along as a companion to his pregnant wife, and while abroad kept a meticulous personal journal which is now published for the first time.

There is little to be said in favor of this woman as a writer. Many of her pages deal with the trivial every day items in a traveller's life. As she was well aware, she lacked the imagination to give her experiences significance. The value of the book lies in the glimpses we get of Longfellow before he became known as a national hero. His ability to find time to bury himself in libraries and acquaint himself with three new languages, at the same time caring for the three women in his charge (there was another woman along part of the time), strikes the reader as something Herculean. The knowledge he gained in Denmark, Sweden, and Holland, in spite of terrible handicaps, indicates that his cast of mind had a natural affinity for the rich

material in the sagas of Northern Europe, and explains, perhaps, why some of his best poetry deals with the stories of the wild Viking northland. We also get a detailed day by day account of the misadventure, the last illness, and the early death of the attractive Mary Potter, who was definitely too delicate to be subjected to the hardships of European travel in 1835. In those days the roads were rough, the carriages often without springs, and the hotel accommodations sometimes execrable.

We see Longfellow in one of his darkest hours as he grieved over the body of his beloved in Rotterdam. In his grief he turned for comfort to Clara, and at times apparently became overly hungry for sympathy. He soon righted himself and realized that Clara could be nothing more to him than a friend. We see him settling down in Heidelberg, mastering German script, burying himself in German literature, and writing poems himself in German. Probably these were the most scholarly hours of his life, for on his first European journey he had been the poet stalking life rather than the scholar burning the midnight oil.

We see him taking trips around the Rhineland country, soaking up German legends, superstitions, stories and scenery. We get a slight view of the William Cullen Bryant family who were spending a year in Germany. We see Miss Crowninshield and Longfellow reading German plays together. "I have finished 'Egmont' with Mr. Longfellow" is one entry that intrigued me, but the author discloses nothing further. We see them attending a concert together at which the diarist reports "the music from Handel was solemn—Judas Maccabeus," and suspect that here lay the germ of one of his lesser known but interesting dramatic poems written late in his career.

However dull this book may be to the general reader, it holds much of interest to close students of Longfellow. Mr. Hilen, the editor, has done his work well. He tends to overrate Clara as a diarist, but that is natural in a young scholar introducing a long-buried book to the public for the first time. His notes are brief, clear, and to the point, and his introduction, though a bit too sympathetic, is excellent. Friends and careful students of Longfellow are grateful to him for this contribution.

Wesleyan University (Conn.)

WILBERT SNOW

Roy R. Male, *Hawthorne's Tragic Vision* (Austin, Texas: Univ. of Texas Press, 1957. ix + 187 pp. \$3.75). THIS is a brilliant book. Randall Stewart is quoted on the jacket as saying that it is "an important contribution" to Hawthorne criticism, and I wholly agree. Mr. Male understands and likes his subject, and he is on fire with an idea, or rather with a group of related ideas. He rides his ideas a little too hard, I think, and sometimes writes as though nothing of real consequence had been previously done on Hawthorne; but the best parts of his book are so very good that one feels a little ashamed at having been irritated in places.

The chapter on "Rappaccini's Daughter" alone would justify putting the book on the required reading list for Hawthorne students. It is certainly the best thing that has been done on that beautiful and difficult story. The chapter on *The Scarlet Letter* is wonderfully rewarding in the fresh insights that are produced by Mr. Male's application of his thesis to that work. The discussion of *The Marble Faun* offers a fine general analysis and makes significant and I think valid corrections in Fogle's and my own attempts to understand the book. The discussion of "The Gentle Boy" is the most perceptive that I know of, and makes that story seem much more rewarding than many of us had thought, without, I think, reading anything into it that is not, potentially, there. Chapter two, relating Hawthorne to his contemporaries, is a skillful and rewarding brief exercise in literary history. It achieves the difficult goal of preserving Hawthorne's individuality without making him seem an anomaly.

A thesis capable of producing such impressive results when applied to Hawthorne's four finished romances and a number of his best short stories must have considerable justification: what it reveals is the measure of its relevance. The briefest statement of Mr. Male's thesis is made by implication only, in the epigraph from Ecclesiastes, "A time to rend, and a time to sew." Man rends, explores, speculates; woman sews, conserves, invests. Man's is the spatial vision, woman's the temporal. Hawthorne's "one fruitful subject was the problem of moral growth"; and his most successful treatments of it confront a man and a woman. In the confrontation, the man either grows to maturity or fails the test; if he does grow, his "angle of vision," which has been "essentially protestant, revolutionary, and spatial," is suitably modified by his contact with the woman, whose ambiguity of good and evil he must learn to accept. "As love stories, Hawthorne's romances are centered upon the Original Sin. For it

seems clear that he interpreted the Original Sin as the mutual love of man and woman . . . his tragic vision in the romances eventually leads back through *Paradise Lost* to Ecclesiastes and Genesis." Hawthorne develops his antitheses in a way that preserves their sexual, moral, and cultural implications and ends by writing at once the myth of New England, the myth of America (with its predominantly masculine, speculative, spatial vision) and the myth of mankind. "In order to develop his full human potential, man must become fully involved with time yet retain his unique ability to stand aside from its fleeting onrush and contemplate the eternal. This is the tragic vision of Hawthorne's fiction."

Here we have both a point of view and a thesis, or several theses. Of the point of view the relevant question is whether it helps or hinders the author's effort to understand his subject. There seems to me to be no question that Mr. Male's point of view, which is closely akin to Hawthorne's own, is an advantage to him in his enterprise. As for the thesis or theses, I could wish that Mr. Male had been both more direct and outspoken, on the one hand, and more concerned to limit his statements with the appropriate qualifications, on the other. Demanding plain statement will seem crass, and sighing for the missing qualifiers pedantic and quibbling; but in an argumentative book such as this is, one would like to know for sure, not just by implication, precisely what the terms of the argument are. Are they all contained, again by implication, in Mr. Male's suggestion that "The last four books of *Paradise Lost* remain the best introduction to Hawthorne"? If so, few Hawthorne scholars and critics will wish to quarrel with them. But if there is a serious fault in this book it is that its frequently very penetrating insights are not always adequately balanced by "outsight," by logical analysis and a concern for evidence.

A sometimes *ex cathedra* tone, occasional generalizations that are very difficult to argue with (even though they seem unsound) because, like the sort of thing one finds so commonly in myth criticism, one can't quite pin them down, some forced readings and a few that are merely conscientious applications of the thesis—these are the weaknesses in a book that impresses us at once with the singleness of its vision and with the intense illumination achieved by that vision. They would not be worth mentioning at all if the book were not so good, or if several of them were not so typical of the way scholar-critics of the youngest generation seem to be developing as they move toward critical syncretism. The ideal of scholarly caution gives way

to the ideal of achieving a synthesis of all American studies: no wonder the generalizations seem sometimes premature, the system too soon closed. I find it somewhat ironic that the one mode of criticism that Mr. Male explicitly rejects is "criticism that insists solely on image-counting or study of fictional techniques": ironic because the best things in the book seem to me to be just those close readings I have mentioned, and because the least impressive parts of the book are those readings in which Mr. Male is more intent on applying his categories than on the stories themselves. It still seems to me that the most useful thing a critic can do is to point and not to dogmatize.

Criticism and scholarship refuse to stand still. It would not surprise me at all if a good many "old scholars" were enraged by this book. Middle-aged scholar-critics are likely to be deeply impressed but to have some reservations. Graduate students will probably find it the best critical book yet written on Hawthorne. They may well be right. At least I shall not quarrel with them very hard.

Brown University

HYATT H. WAGGONER

Patricia Thomson, *The Victorian Heroine: A Changing Ideal, 1837-1873* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1956. 178 pp. \$2.90). IN *Diana of the Crossways* (1885) the heroine declares, "*Men may have rounded Seraglio Point: they have not yet doubled Cape Turk.*" Miss Thomson (who misquotes Meredith's aphorism in her Prologue) regales the reader with the vicissitudes of women in working the ship past the first promontory. Taking as her initial and terminal dates the years of the ascension of Queen Victoria and of the death of that ardent feminist John Stuart Mill, she undertakes to show, through reference to one hundred and two novels of varying degrees of literary significance, the impact of feminine emancipation upon the ideal of womanhood expressed in English fiction during this period. Although the book is amateurishly and inadequately documented, its style is for the most part vigorous and witty. Occasionally the author strains too obviously for clever effects, and she has an unfortunate penchant for nouns as adjectives ("boundary dates," "morality themes," "employment position"). Nevertheless, her work offers an engaging and informative account of a particular facet of social and literary history.

In six chapters that treat such subjects as good works, governesses, laboring and professional women, marriage, "honourable spinster-

hood," prostitution, and the single standard of morality, this study reveals how the Victorian novel reflects changing attitudes of the time toward the scope of woman's activity and toward her economic, legal, and social position. Miss Thomson finds the opinions and values of the novelists, like those of their less literary contemporaries, divided and often uncertain; but, especially from within covers seldom opened today, she gleans evidence of freedom of thought and forthrightness of expression concerning the aims and aspirations of the British female. There can be no doubt that by 1873 the progress of feminism had inevitably affected the novelists' conception of the role of the heroine and her handmaidens.

Apparently as a consequence of reaching the first of her two primary conclusions—"that the interplay between the feminist movement and the Victorian novel was far more considerable than any cursory reading of the great novelists alone would lead one to suspect"—Miss Thomson displays an unwarranted asperity toward Dickens, Thackeray, and Meredith. To sustain the contention that minor rather than major novels provide the true barometer of variations in the sociological climate does not require her to convict these three of timidity, hypocrisy, and indecision. Indeed, her treatment of them suggests a somewhat cursory reading on her own part; and she has a tendency to cite particulars from their novels without taking into consideration the total imaginative context. Her assertions on p. 140 that "the wild oats motif . . . formed the main theme of . . . *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*" and that Meredith "declined to come to any satisfactory conclusion" concerning it call into question her critical acumen. Further, the lack of any reference in the discussion of the *demi-monde* to Meredith's brilliant portrayal of Mrs. Mount seems a notable omission. Miss Thomson's impatience with the major novelists, to some extent, mars the tone of her work and restricts the usefulness and subtlety of her literary history. The second conclusion of the book—that investigation reveals no "one widely shared Victorian ideal of womanhood"—is a salutary reminder of the individuality and vitality of the mid-Victorian mind and of the danger of facile generalizations about the literature of any period.

Despite limitations, this volume presents a concise and plausible record of a remarkable ferment of ideas—ideas that, according to Miss Thomson, charted the future course of the English heroine in fiction.

University of Virginia

EDGAR F. SHANNON, JR.

Per Nykrog, *Les Fabliaux* (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1957. lv + 339 pp.).

THIS revision of a subtle and learned Danish doctoral dissertation suffers somewhat from the author's attempt to ride two horses at once. It is both a detailed criticism of Bédier, *Les Fabliaux* and an introduction and interpretation of the genre ("une introduction générale à la lecture des fabliaux," p. 19). Nykrog would, I think, have done better to have disposed of Bédier briefly in an article. He could then have written a book inspired by the enthusiasm expressed in his words, "Car on ne peut pas comprendre le XIII^e siècle littéraire sans avoir compris le fabliau." By offering a professional criticism of Bédier and, for that matter, of Edmond Faral and by giving much information in no completely organized fashion Nykrog has produced neither a technical treatise nor an introduction.

Nykrog begins with a well-informed historical review of studies devoted to *fabliaux* (pp. vii-lv) that is something more and better than an essay on the "Stand der Forschung." As a genre or individually, *fabliaux* have been the subject of literary historical studies for the long period of two centuries. From the beginning the problems of origins and of the relation of the genre to medieval culture have been to the fore. Nykrog might have set his comment on Caylus, *Mémoire sur les fabliaux* (1746) against the background of the vogue of the *contes orientaux*, and the English translations of Legrand's anthology with such titles as *Tales of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries* (1786), *Norman Tales* (1786), and *Tales of the Minstrels* (1800) against a background of Romantic medievalism and interest in the folk. Nykrog's survey and the bibliography (pp. 292-308) on which it rests include almost everything one expects to find and are neatly organized. It would have been helpful to have cited Hjalmar Crohns's two studies in medieval exempla (p. 305) more precisely by reference to the *Förhandlingar* of the Finska Vetenskaps-societet rather than to reprints. Bartlett Jere Whiting's collection of proverbs used in the *fabliaux* replaces Loth's virtually inaccessible German *Programm* for most of us. It is not surprising that Nykrog overlooked this collection in B. J. Whiting, *Chaucer's Use of Proverbs* (Cambridge, Mass., 1934). Since he cites Silvestre de Sacy's *Calilah et Dimnah* of 1816 (p. 307) as historically important in the discussion of the origins of *fabliaux*, he might have included Laurits Bødker, ed., Christian Nielsen, *De gamle vijses exempler oc hoffsprock* (Copenhagen, 1951-1953), which brings the bibliography of this collection

(the *Pancatantra*) up to date. In the very useful inventory of *fabliaux* (pp. 309-325) Nykrog could have included references to studies by Wesselofski and Oldenburg, who wrote in Russian, and Toldo's article that I mention later.

Nykrog deals briefly with Bédier's attack on the Oriental origins of *fabliaux* (pp. xxix-xxxvii, 263-265) and shows with much ingenuity that Bédier is attacking the ideas of his teacher Gaston Paris and ultimately the ideas of John Dunlop but not the ideas of Theodor Benfey and Reinhold Köhler. It does not become entirely clear what the issue is. Nykrog seems to concede that certain themes are of Oriental origin. He might here have cited Friedrich von der Leyen's savage criticism in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, cxvi (1906), 292-300. More important for Nykrog's purposes is Gaston Paris, "Die undankbare Gattin," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, xiii (1903), 1-24, 129-150, which escaped his notice. Is not this Paris's posthumous reply to Bédier? Had Nykrog seen this article, he would have noted Pietro Toldo's valuable collectanea and studies that begin in this volume of the *Zeitschrift* and extend through several years. Nykrog makes it clear that Bédier's arguments and ideas about origins are confused and even included denial (p. xxx) of the often-quoted "polygenèse des contes." I cannot make out clearly what either Bédier or Nykrog think. On pp. xxv-xxvi he concedes that some *fabliaux* "come from India" and on p. 265 he denies it. He may be talking in some instances of the medieval genre and in others of the themes. He deals briefly and well with Faral's derivation of *fabliaux* (i. e., the genre) from an earlier medieval Latin genre and shows the two kinds of tales to be "cousins germains" (see pp. xvliii-liiii). He seems to be of much the same opinion about medieval German tales in verse and Italian *novelle* (pp. 257-260). His own explanation of the origin of the genre (pp. 242-257) traces it from the pseudo-Esopic fables of Marie de France, which he calls (p. 253) "fabliaux avant la lettre." All this would have been expounded more clearly and effectively, had Nykrog been writing his own introduction and not a refutation of Bédier's theories.

Nykrog's book deals at great length with Bédier's arguments against classifying *fabliaux* as a genre of courtly literature and for assigning them to the bourgeoisie. His refutation seems altogether convincing. It is written with much verve. The book is attractively printed and adequately indexed. Although the treatment of comparative studies

leaves a little to be desired, the book is the first place to which one should turn for information about *fabliaux*.

University of California, Berkeley

ARCHER TAYLOR

Robert V. Merrill with Robert J. Clements, *Platonism in French Renaissance Poetry* (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1957. xii + 215 pp. \$4.50). THE appearance of this volume almost a score of years after it was first announced, and some six years after the untimely death of Robert Valentine Merrill, will be most gratifying to those who had the privilege of knowing this devoted scholar. They will thank his disciple and colleague, Robert J. Clements, for having undertaken and successfully carried through the always arduous task of completing a work begun by another. They will thank him also for the excellent idea of including, in an appropriately expanded form, his own chapter on "The Four Furies," which had appeared in the *Romanic Review* of October, 1954, under the title of "Ronsard and Ficino on the Four Furies."

The student of French Renaissance poetry who may hereafter wish to trace the fortune of many Platonic themes in the works of the Pléiade and of several other poets of the sixteenth century in France, will find much to reward him in the present volume. Indeed, the author has in a real sense given more than the title promises, for the various Platonic themes are often usefully traced through their modifications at the hands of Plato's followers in the Academy, in the thought of Plotinus, Proclus, and Saint Augustine, and in the writings of Renaissance Platonists like Marsilio Ficino, Benivieni, and Pico della Mirandola.

The themes that Professor Merrill followed from their origin in the work of Plato to their ultimate use, and abuse, by the French poets, treat of original Chaos, of Creation, the World-Soul, the Soul of man, the Ideal World, Reminiscence, and many other subjects discussed in the *Republic*, the *Symposium*, the *Timaeus*, the *Phaedrus*, and in the lesser Platonic dialogues.

If, on the one hand, the author has given us more than the title promised, it is nevertheless true that, in a sense equally real, he has given us less. For the book is conceived not as a study of the influence of Platonism, but as a study of the fortune of Platonic themes. There is not only a fundamental difference between the substantive

results that each of these distinct researches can be expected to give, but there is also, in implication, a profound difference of attitude toward the nature of scholarly research and, as a direct inference, an equally profound difference with respect to the method by which such research ought to be pursued.

The study of the fortune of disassociated Platonic (or Aristotelian, or Democritean) themes, even where the investigation is based on an exhaustive enumeration of subjects treated, can do no more than convey an imperfect idea of the central doctrine of the author in question. Indeed, it seems just to say that the severance into artificially discontinuous elements of those aspects of his thought which have an organic relation to each other, adds greatly to the difficulty of understanding it. If carried to excess, this process may deform his thought, and make it virtually impossible to understand the true nature of his influence upon later writers.

It should be clear that the problem involved is not the superficial one of whether the title of this volume is appropriately chosen. Nothing would be substantially changed if in a later edition this book were to be entitled "Platonic Themes in French Renaissance Poetry." It is a problem that goes to the heart of the nature and method of scholarly research. Upon the manner in which it is met and solved depends the possible human fruitfulness or sterility of scholarly effort.

This study is peculiarly valuable as a touchstone of the validity of the position adopted here. Few bodies of philosophic writing have at once the intellectual homogeneity and the immense poetic appeal of the Platonic dialogues, and few periods in the history of literature have produced a group of poets so largely united in doctrine and in style as those of the French Renaissance. The opportunity was therefore unique to see how the ideas of Plato, in their organic complexity and interrelatedness, as well as in the beauty of their poetic presentation, might affect a generation of poets to whom the world of Hellenic thought was being revealed in an intellectual and aesthetic experience almost unparalleled in occidental literature.

This opportunity was largely lost because an atomistic method was applied to an investigation which urgently called for organic treatment. Most of the chapters begin with, or subsequently introduce, quotations of just those portions of the relevant Platonic dialogues which will suffice to give the reader the required orientation for pursuing the themes presented. Plato's thought is thus necessarily dispersed through some 200 pages. The reader sees only enough of it

at a time to be able to follow the "theme," the "familiar expression," the "keyword," alas! even the "tag," in its various appearances in the pages of the Renaissance poets. The more zealously we follow the author in this pursuit, the more certainly do we abandon Plato . . . and Du Bellay and Ronsard. It is not possible for the spirit to inhabit the organized universe of discourse of Plato and at the same time to retain an interest in the peripheral destinies of his ideas considered as atomized particles. The effort to do so does violence to our sense of the nobility of Plato's thought, for we are alternately invited to read and reflect upon the most moving passages in his greatest dialogues, and then to fly after the fragments of his thought, dispersed in the writings of a dozen poets, in a flight that is made breathless and vain by the play of so many themes among the works of so many poets.

Platonism in French Renaissance Poetry would have been a more interesting, integrated, and valuable book if the thought of Plato and his interpreters, in so far as it influenced the poets of the sixteenth century in France, had been presented in a unified introductory chapter, instead of in dispersal throughout the volume; and if the Platonic influence upon each of the French poets had been presented in a separate chapter. Such a method would have preserved the structure of Plato's thought in itself and in its reflection in each of the poets here studied. As it is, one can only say with immense regret, borrowing from Professor Merrill's lucid remarks on Plato's theory of Ideas: "Thus behind the shadowy jumble of matter . . . a clear, bright and orderly universe awaits conquest by the devout and patient mind."

Washington University

ISIDORE SILVER

V. S. Lublinsky,¹ ed., *Lettres de Voltaire* (Moscow and Leningrad: Editions de l'Académie des Sciences de l'U.R.S.S., 1956. 432 pp.). THIS important book is a continuation of the work previously published in 1937.² In fact, many footnotes will refer to that edition.

¹ Vladimir S. Lublinsky, a well-known Russian authority on Voltaire—not to be confused with P. I. Lublinsky, an equally well-known Russian scholar who is an authority on Diderot.

² Most of the material was published in Russian translation in *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo*, Vol. 29/30, 1937. The texts in the original language were to be published in 1941.

The original manuscript of the present volume was to be published in 1941, but it was destroyed during the war.

The author's purpose as stated in 1937 is to contribute his utmost to the reconstruction of Voltaire's letters. On this subject, Lublinsky highly praises the editor of *Voltaire's Correspondence*, Theodore Besterman, whose work he refers to as "heroic." However, Lublinsky is chagrined for two reasons. One is that works in Russian relative to Voltaire have not been taken into sufficient consideration outside Russia, because of the unrealistic, outdated, and harmful notion "*Rossica non leguntur*."³ The other reason is occasioned by Mr. Besterman's remark that: "... authentic copies are available [outside Russia] of nearly all letters [of Voltaire] at Leningrad." Perhaps⁴ Mr. Besterman had tried unsuccessfully to obtain copies of these letters from Russia. Indirectly, the abundance of new material presented in this volume constitutes Lublinsky's answer. But the reason stated by Lublinsky is that he hopes that these new texts together with their pertinent annotations will contribute their share to *Voltaire's Correspondence* as well as all research in connection with Voltaire.

The book is divided into five sections. It includes, besides customary prefaces and annotations, four annexes,⁵ a summary in French, and an alphabetical index of names. Ample textual criticism giving details about appearance, history, and content is provided in each preface. The text of the letters is carefully annotated and edited without, however, "adhering to all the idiosyncrasies of the 18th century spelling . . . but conforming to the principles admitted by M. Besterman." The letters appear in the original language as well as in Russian translation.

The "pièce de résistance" of this volume is undoubtedly the Vorontsov Collection of some 178 autograph letters of Voltaire located in the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of History. The letters date from 1734 to 1751; i. e., they pertain to the period of Voltaire's life in Cirey, his travels in the nearby area, and comprise a year and a half of Voltaire's stay in Prussia following the death of the Marquise du Châtelet. Most of the letters are addressed to the "ange

³ See, among others, p. 77, last note to entry XVI.

⁴ The word *perhaps*, here, is a euphemism. It appears that on occasion Russian scholars are not averse to competition.

⁵ The first annex is appended to Section II. It reproduces the text of Voltaire's letter of August 30, 1748 to Nicolas-René Berryer, lieutenant-general of police. The remaining three annexes follow Section V. Two of them represent letters to Voltaire while the last annex illustrates the type of material Voltaire gathered for his historical works.

gard
and
Se
for
been
all p
The
publ
to th
TI
poli
relat
mad
the
Publ
Leni
TI
varic
varic
two
The
Se
Olyn
draft
it vi
Se
conta
sulte
logic
auth
Libra
letter
The
of th
Be
press
resul
follow
*TI

gardien," Count d'Argental, several letters are addressed to his wife, and a few to his brother, Pont-de-Veyle.

Section I reproduces 70 letters of that collection, 22 of which appear for the first time in the original language.⁶ Forty-eight others have been published either partially or altered beyond recognition and for all practical purposes appear for the first time in their intended form. The remaining 108 letters of that collection have been previously published more or less correctly, but additional information pertaining to them appears in Section V.

The second section sheds new light on the so-called "Dossier de police" acquired after the fall of the Bastille. It describes Voltaire's relations with the police and points to the corrections which should be made in the previous publications. The "dossier" is classified as the Autograph Collection No. 288 which is located in the State Public Library known under the name of Saltikof-Stchedrin in Leningrad.

The third section mentions 23 unpublished letters of Voltaire in various collections of the U. S. S. R. The letters are addressed to various personalities. Ten are addressed to Catherine II. Twenty-two are reproduced *in toto*. One (No. 16) presents only a few lines. The balance of the text will appear in Volume II.

Section IV is entitled the *Project of Dedication of the Tragedy Olympe to I. I. Shuvalov*. Actually, this consists of one letter in draft form, but the text is well known in Russian translation because it vividly portrays Voltaire's views on the theater.

Section V is of special interest, for, as the author points out, it contains the names and addresses of appropriate libraries to be consulted in reference to the publishing of Voltaire's letters and a chronological survey of letters located in Russian collections. However, the author warns that the survey does not include the letters in Voltaire's Library in Leningrad which number about 260, nor the newly found letters addressed to Voltaire which will appear in the next volume. The annexes in which letters to Voltaire are published give samples of the subject matter destined to appear in Volume II.

Because of the urgency of the present edition, perhaps an undue pressure was placed on the publishers, and the inevitable misprints resulted. For instance, in the notes to Section II the page numbers following the abbreviations for "see above" should be raised by three.

⁶ These texts first appeared only in Russian translation in 1937. See Note 2.

This probably stems from the insertion, between the two sections, of three unnumbered pages which are counted in the pagination. On page 40, the date for letter No. 110 in the Vorontsov Collection should be 1746. Corrections to the table on pages 42-43 are as follows: No. 875 referring to the Moland edition is a misprint for 857; its corresponding number in the Besterman edition should be No. 1427. No. 1470 in the Moland edition column is missing and should be inserted; its equivalent number in the Besterman edition is No. 2371 and in the Vorontsov Collection No. 45. The first of the four numbers (each representing a different text) in the Vorontsov Collection column, opposite Moland's No. 1040, should be 47, not 46. On page 43, two texts should be indicated in the Vorontsov Collection column, opposite Moland's No. 1920; the missing text is No. 138. On page 323 in the unnumbered entry immediately preceding entry 125, the corresponding number in the Vorontsov Collection is No. 83 and the page number should be changed from 109 to 335.

The rest of the misprints we noticed in this volume can be attributed, we think, to a single cause; namely, to the confusion between two systems of numbering the texts in the Vorontsov Collection, where No. 23 appears twice. To facilitate the work of scholars now engaged in research, Lublinsky substitutes for the numbers of the old index the numbers arranged in the order of physical sequence. Thus, the second No. 23 becomes twenty-four, and each of the following numbers is increased by one. But inadvertently some of the old numbers remained, and some received a double correction. Hence, the following changes should be noted: On page 87, entry XXV should be No. 95, not 94; p. 117, entry L should be No. 125, not 124; p. 295, entry 38 should be No. 22,⁷ not 21; p. 315, entry 93 should be No. 46, not 45; p. 317, entry 104 should be No. 96, not 95. In the case of double corrections on page 319, entry 109 should be No. 30, not 31; on page 323, entry 124 should be No. 72, not 73. Other corrections are indicated in the *errata* affixed to the last page.

Notwithstanding the mechanical errors, the texts presented in this volume are obviously valuable, not only because they are new but because they help to clarify what seems to have been a rather obscure period in Voltaire's life. Important also are Lublinsky's textual comparisons relative to the previously published material and his indica-

⁷ In Section V, numbers expressed in Russian words refer to the place occupied by each letter in the Vorontsov Collection. We have used arabic numerals since they appear in Section I, including reference tables on pp. 40-43.

tion of the changes which should be made therein. If it were for this alone, the book represents a substantial contribution to Voltaire scholarship.

The author does not claim his task has been completed. "As twenty years ago," writes Lublinsky, "we do not in any way pretend to have exhausted the subject . . . probably as before, certain documents escaped our attention. . . ." As research continues, other documents are likely to be discovered. Some have appeared while this book was being proofread. Most of this new material is in the form of letters to Voltaire which will be published in the next volume.

College of William and Mary

PIERRE C. OUSTINOFF

Roland Mortier, *Les "Archives Littéraires de l'Europe" (1804-1808) et le cosmopolitisme littéraire sous le Premier Empire* (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1957. 251 pp. Académie Royale de Belgique, Mémoires, LI, 4). IT is surely most gratifying, in these times of too often flashy and scamped productions, to come across a study bearing the mark of true workmanship. Such indeed is Roland Mortier's *Les "Archives Littéraires de l'Europe" (1804-1808) et le Cosmopolitisme littéraire sous le Premier Empire*. Its author is, of course, not unknown to students of this particular period who are interested in the relations of France with her neighbors. A previous work of his, *Un Précurseur de Mme de Staël: Charles Vanderbourg (1765-1827)*, published in 1955, was a worthy herald of the present one. There, too, we noticed the methodical approach to his subject, the order and clarity in exposition, the felicitous simplicity of expression which are this writer's distinguishing features.

The book reads easily. As far as subject-matter is concerned, it must be admitted that it does not offer essentially new material. In many respects, the article by Roland Mortier which appeared in the *Revue de Littérature comparée* in 1951 under the title *Une Revue germanisante sous l'Empire: les "Archives Littéraires de l'Europe," 1804-1808* might be called an outline of the present work. However, to the primordial skeleton much flesh has been added, and the twenty-page article has become a fair-sized book, not only through closer and more detailed attention to previously stated facts, but also by enlarging the field of investigation. As its title indicated, the article was focused on the interest of the *A. L. E.* only in German thought

and literature. The book, on the other hand, includes other literatures as well: English, Italian, Spanish, even Dutch and Danish. It thus throws into sharp relief the fact that the *A. L. E.* was not only an agent for the dissemination in France of German ideas both literary and philosophic, but contributed substantially to a cosmopolitan movement which, although born in the previous century, was by then steadily gaining in breadth and momentum, thus foreshadowing its future blossoming and coming to fruition.

As happens in all cases where an object is studied at close range, the temptation was to magnify out of proportion the *A. L. E.*'s influence on the contemporary movement of ideas and literature. M. Mortier's most sympathetic, understanding, and scrupulously detailed handling of his topic might easily lead the reader into forgetting that this worthwhile monthly periodical lasted only four short years. Born January 1804, surviving a sharp financial crisis in the latter months of 1805, the *A. L. E.* came to an abrupt end in April 1808. The reasons for this untimely demise—on order of the authorities—are not quite clear (see p. 46); evidence, however, seems to point to jealousy and plotting on the part of the *Mercure de France*, but still more to political opposition in governmental spheres. Napoleon's dislike of foreign ideologies in general and of German ideology in particular is well known, and there is no doubt that the *A. L. E.* was an enterprise which could not help but be looked upon with suspicion: it was the product of a group of essentially liberal-minded men. As far as literature is concerned, M. Mortier takes care to remind us of the filiation already established by René Bray in his *Chronologie du Romantisme*: several of these "liberals" of 1808 were to become the "doctrinaires" of 1825, in other words true Romantics.

A short chapter lists the collaborators of the *A. L. E.* by name and specialties. In most cases, their identity is known, whether they signed their articles with their full name or only with initials. The personality and contributions of the more important ones are reviewed in connection with the history of the *A. L. E.* They include such well known men as F. H. Jacobi, the inspirer and initiator of the periodical; Vanderbourg, its true animator; Degérando, one of its most active contributors; Ch. de Villers, a fervent disciple of Kant; and last but not least, Suard, its nominal head who, while he did not contribute many pages, was nevertheless most useful in that his repute and position lent it the weight of a semi-official approval. Considered as a whole, the group was a cosmopolitan one, which

corresponded to the distinguishing feature of the *A. L. E.*: its cosmopolitan character. This trait can be seen in the origin and make-up of the contributors, of which the foremost ones were almost all former émigrés; in the persons of the publishers who assumed the financial burden of the enterprise, Hendrichs in Paris, Cotta in Tübingen; and lastly but most important, in the very aims, tendencies, and program of the periodical. Indeed, in a liminal article, the Editors were quite definite about what they proposed to do: "Offrir à toutes les personnes qui aiment l'instruction une suite de lectures intéressantes, solides et variées; tenir le public au courant de toutes les nouveautés importantes que l'Europe littéraire produira, voilà le double but qu'ils se sont proposé" (p. 57). And again: "Un Français doit désirer aujourd'hui se former du moins des notions générales sur l'état des lettres en Angleterre, en Italie, en Allemagne et même dans toute l'Europe" (p. 59). Actually, the Editors of the *A. L. E.* were aiming at achieving a Europe-wide spiritual rapprochement which they felt was greatly needed. In the matter of keeping the French public informed about foreign letters, they had had antecedents in periodicals such as *Le Journal étranger*, *L'Année littéraire*, and *La Bibliothèque britannique*. But, although continuators in a sense, they were not imitators: not only did they eliminate all political and purely scientific material, but their stand was definitely their own, their point of view quite personal. Here it may be well to stress the fact that the *Archives* were not limited to foreign literatures, but included French letters as well. This is not one of the negligible elements of their make-up and may account at least in part for their great success both in France and abroad.

It does not fall within the scope of the present review, nor indeed was it the intention of its writer, to give a detailed account of the contents of the *A. L. E.* as they appear in M. Mortier's book. References to given authors—say Lessing, Schiller, Herder, Kant, Ossian, Alfieri, to name only a few—are quite easy, thanks to the orderly character of M. Mortier's exposition on the one hand, and on the other, to the alphabetical Index which is the most valuable, not to say indispensable, adjunct of any study of this kind. We shall only point out here a few items of particular interest. For instance, among the contemporary writers in Germany, the two foremost ones, Schiller and Goethe, receive scant attention only in the main body of the *A. L. E.*—one single article for Schiller, scattered mentions for Goethe—while, as could be expected, they are given considerable

room in the *Gazette littéraire*.¹ Herder, on the contrary, is given full attention; however, he is seen mainly as an historian, in particular an historian of literature.

Another matter which deserves mention is the extent to which the choice of subjects as well as the critical judgments of the *A. L. E.* are determined by a most typically French point of view and bear the mark of the time: an ingrained respect for "Rules" in matters literary; a marked ignorance of, and lack of understanding for folklore; a certain fear of Romantic novelties which had perhaps its roots in the anti-French tendencies of Germany's literary as well as political circles; a refusal to validate a philosophy which led beyond sensualism; and more than all, an allegiance to the concept of what was socially acceptable or not in literature, what could be tolerated or not by French sensibilities. To these prejudices the contributors of the *A. L. E.*, while at the same time fighting them, succumb more than once themselves. Thus Schweighäuser replaces by "un commandement absolu et invincible" the Kantian term of "impératif catégorique" which he judged too barbarous for French ears (p. 160). Thus, too, as late as 1806, speaking of Castro's *Mocedades del Cid*, a critic qualifies the Spaniard's conceptions as "quelquefois sublimes, mais plus souvent bizarres jusqu'à la folie et révoltantes jusqu'au dégoût," and extolls Corneille for having rid his work of the "ordures" which marred his model, for having shown himself able to "tirer de l'or de ce fumier d'Ennius de nos voisins et adapter à la scène française, avec la noblesse et la décence qui le caractérisent, une situation qui avait de grandes beautés et que déparaient entièrement des détails tour à tour puérils et repoussants, dont l'avait surchargée son inventeur" (p. 202).

In spite of these limitations, the *A. L. E.* did fulfil in many respects the task of guide and teacher which it had assumed and which can best be summed up in the words of M. Mortier: "dévoiler à un public, trop sûr de sa supériorité et de la pérennité des valeurs auxquelles il croyait, des horizons insoupçonnés, des pensées originales, mais surtout une nouvelle sensibilité et de l'éclairer sur lui-même par l'exemple d'autrui" (p. 224). As a pathfinder, the *A. L. E.* "discovered" both a dramatist like Werner—whose "énorme drame, dont

¹ A monthly addendum of about twenty-five to thirty small-type pages to the periodical proper, the *Gazette littéraire*, under the heading of the various countries, offered the latest news of the intellectual and literary world abroad. Its purely informative character distinguishes it sharply from the rest of the periodical.

"Luther est le héros" leaves the reviewer full of wonderment and deeply puzzled by the differences in tastes among nations—and a moralist like Lichtenberger, whom the critic ends by suspecting to be, like Tasso or Jean-Jacques, slightly out of his mind. It is not without good reasons, then, that M. Mortier claims for the *A. L. E.* the role of the prospector. Indeed, the reader of his study cannot but feel impressed by the extent in which this periodical showed itself in advance of its times in many ways. In its pages can be found already, although still in a budding state only, the method of comparative literature which recognizes, beyond the boundaries of time and place, "les liens d'une fraternité littéraire et philosophique" (p. 172). Comparative examination of themes or subjects, comparative search for literary sources, comparative approach to the study of languages: it all stems from the cosmopolitan point of view which was the main-spring of the *A. L. E.*

All this M. Mortier brings out in a most able and felicitous way. He is scholarly and precise without pedantry. And without undue digressions, he manages to weave in some quite interesting asides. Thus the "douleur *naturaliste*" of a quotation leads him to explain this word, a neologism still rarely used in 1804 and which, built on the model of *réel-réaliste*, was meant to denote a state in conformity with nature, not yet polished by art (p. 115). Thus, too, there are details about neologisms like "esthétique" (p. 120 and 173), "sensualisme," which dates from 1801 (p. 154), and the first appearance in the *A. L. E.* of 1804, of "romantique" in the meaning of belonging to a certain literary school (p. 117). At the same time, while passing in review the subject matter of the *A. L. E.*, M. Mortier notes the reasons for the greater or smaller number of articles on a given subject, points out the particular interest of certain items, and illustrates his summaries with abundant but always pertinent quotations. Neither does he hesitate to pass judgments himself and indulge in critical appraisal of the contributors' views. Scholarly research is given its due place when it comes to discover, for instance, what reviewer is hiding behind certain initials. In this kind of game, speculation plays its part and possible errors may easily slip in. The identification of Suard with the *E. H.* of the *Lettre d'un vieil amateur* is a case in point: it is based on an assumption (see p. 39, n. 4) which, to this reader at least, does not appear as quite convincing but which nevertheless is considered as such by the author and used accordingly further on (p. 213). This, however, is a point

of minor importance. We are less inclined to indulgence and forgiveness when hopes are raised only to be subsequently disappointed. Thus, when speaking of Herder as a literary figure, M. Mortier states (p. 129) that he will return to this author in the section of his book dealing with metaphysics; this turns out, however, to be merely the mention of his name in two places (pp. 169 and 176).

All through our attentive and interested reading a name kept coming back to our mind with almost the compelling urgency of a presence: that of Mme de Staël. Indeed, the whole atmosphere of the *A. L. E.* is that of *De la littérature* and still more *De l'Allemagne*. No one will read the words of Degérando (1804) quoted on p. 61, "On ne s'enrichit que par les échanges," without immediately being reminded of the well-known phrase in *De l'Allemagne*, "On se trouve donc bien en tous pays d'accueillir les pensées étrangères; car dans ce genre, l'hospitalité fait la fortune de celui qui reçoit." What relationship is there between the *A. L. E.* and Mme de Staël? How strong or how weak are the threads that seem to link the one to the other? Some of the collaborators to the *A. L. E.* did belong at one time or another to the circle of Coppet. One wishes that M. Mortier had at least partially answered the many questions that arise concerning the matter. But, although he mentions Mme. de Staël repeatedly, except for a brief paragraph, he does so, as it were, *en passant* only. This reticence may be due to a repugnance to enter a territory which has still to be fully explored, or which may well be the subject of a forthcoming publication of his. Be that as it may, he does mention the presence in the library at Coppet of some obscure books which are dealt with in the *A. L. E.*; but why does he use the word *troublant* (p. 232) in this connection?

The present book can be regarded as the definitive study on the *A. L. E.* In its so pleasantly written pages, searchers will find much to glean.² For those who simply want to get a taste of its style and atmosphere, the numerous quotations cleverly woven by the author into his text will suffice. Those who want more will have to turn to the seventeen volumes of the *A. L. E.* itself. Analytical studies of periodicals may appear to some as dull, if not superfluous. By essence they are criticism compounded, and certain minds will always prefer to go directly to the texts themselves. Yet such studies are

² The author points out, p. 75, that comparatists will profit greatly by looking into the pages of the *A. L. E.* for informative material.

a great time-saving device and one can only be thankful to those who, like M. Mortier, are willing to help out by reconnoitering first, and then acting as well-informed guides. One most valuable aspect of periodicals is that they show us history in the making. By their very contradictions, gropings, and errors in judgment, as well as by their clever insights into what is still to be, they reflect life's process of becoming. They give us the feel and, as it were, the picture in slow motion of what, having reached maturity, is easily recognizable in the works of first-rank writers. In his concluding lines, M. Mortier points out that the worth of the *A. L. E.* lies in this obscure and patient labor which has opened the path for the great initiators of literary cosmopolitanism. His own greatest achievement is that he manages to give us this feeling of life's unfolding and constant progress, while at the same time he keeps our sense of direction steady and does not allow us to lose sight of the goal towards which, slowly but unequivocally, literature and thought were moving at the dawn of the 19th century.

University of California, Berkeley

JACQUELINE E. DE LA HARPE

Alfred Glauser, *Hugo et la poésie pure* (Geneva: Droz, and Paris: Minard, 1957. xiii + 132 pp.). THIS flamboyant essay has its qualities; among which, briefness. But an excess of dross obscures the insight which flashes out at uneven intervals: too many pointless digressions, too many repetitions, loose metaphors, overstatements and underexposures. Too much beating around the burning bush. Rashness is the price paid by Mr. Glauser for the zest with which he writes. He would probably accept to be counted as a disciple of Thibaudet, to whom he once devoted a lengthy study. Stylistically speaking, the influence is not entirely safe. Add to it the booming into which one almost inevitably expands in Hugo's protracted vicinity, and one is confronted with a brand of rhetoric which avoids neither pretentiousness nor woolliness.

A few examples from the first pages of the book may suffice to illustrate the point. "C'est d'ailleurs avec conscience du jeu, avec volonté, nous dirions même avec critique, que Hugo divague. Il a le suprême sens critique de Dieu lui-même, qui connaît ses possibilités, ses aurores comme ses crépuscules. . . . Sans choisir, ses vers refont l'univers" (p. xii). This is actually the second page of text, and

Mr. Glauser is already in full swing. We may wonder how one manages to "divaguer avec critique" (unless an obscure self-reference is intended) only to rebuild the universe without choosing. We may also ask why a God who knows his possibilities (sic) is conjured up in this context, or what is added to the following similarly irritating passage by Valeryan reminiscences: "Il est le poète qui peut tout, hormis cela: nommer Dieu. S'il ne le nomme pas, c'est qu'il est presque lui. Entre lui et Dieu, il y a la distance infinie et infranchissable de Zénon d'Elée. Arrivé à ce plafond de son ascension, il est 'Achille immobile à grands pas.' Si le poète ne peut pas nommer Dieu, il *sera* Dieu." A few lines further, these illuminating remarks are supplemented by the observation that Hugo is the only writer to have entitled one of his works with the naked word: God. Brushing aside minor ambiguities, let us attempt to recapitulate. If Hugo *does not name* God, it is *because* he is almost God; an *infinite* distance separates him from God, yet, *since* he cannot name God, he *will be* God; he is the only writer to *name* God so directly. The italics are mine, the order of argumentation is entirely Mr. Glauser's.

After this preliminary scuffle in the name of coherence and common sense, one is happy to admit that the main point of the essay is extremely well taken and draws attention to an essential aspect of Hugo's poetic creativity: his drunkenness with words, a mastery over them which often seems complete subservience. What Mr. Glauser calls pure poetry are those moments when subject matter becomes infinitely tenuous, transparent, and the sounds of language take over to guide the poem from one line or stanza to the next. This is the kingdom of airy inventions, whirling vowels, and twisting syllables in which Hugo is especially at home. The numerous examples adduced by Mr. Glauser staunchly support his argument. Hugo does frequently shift, as it were, to a special gear, recognizable by the sheer gratuity and buoyancy of the poetry that pours forth on such occasions. Having made his point and discovered that Hugo is often drawn forward by the pull of rhyme or assonance—after all, not as audacious an assumption as the critic may believe, and one that has been part and parcel of general poetic theory for a number of generations—the reader may admire the inexhaustible enthusiasm with which Mr. Glauser proceeds to make the discovery time and again.

Other repetitions are less warranted; they involve, without explaining them, the author's own poetics and his concept of language. A reiterated equivalence between subject and poem would seem to place

Mr. Glauser squarely in the center of the most obdurate realists' citadel. Each poem, he implies, not only imitates whatever it is about, but tends to identify itself with it, to "become" it. The craggy wall of Gavarnie, waiting to be hollowed out by centuries of water, corresponds to the poem's beginning, cold, brooding, and uncouth. Little by little, the rains begin to pour, "non seulement les pluies de *janvier livide et nu*, mais la pluie des mots, coupée, cinglante, perforant la zone verbale, se faisant un chemin. . . . Voyez-la, féroce, sortant du rocher pour filtrer aussi insistante et folle dans la roche sonore qui s'effrite, travaille, s'anime" (p. 11). This pattern of equivalence is the leitmotiv of Mr. Glauser's critical venture. It enables him to play a delightful game; but is it more than a game?

"S'adressant aux prophètes, aux devins, qui tous sont porteurs de mystère, voici que montent des paroles qui sont plus créatrices de mystères qu'explicatrices" (p. 43). "*Le scorpion au fond d'une pierre dormant* n'est-il pas, par ses sons enchevêtrés, le lieu animal tout trouvé pour *Clytemnestre aux bras d'Egishe son amant*?" (p. 56). "Le rien auquel l'esprit humain aboutit est dit dans une sorte de rien poétique" (p. 59). "Les strophes des *Etoiles filantes* sont aussi éblouissantes que les passantes de l'azur. . ." (p. 66). "Un rythme imitatif crée le poème de *Sara la baigneuse*, poème-escarpolette, dont la nudité de sens correspond à celle de la baigneuse" (p. 75). "*Le Pas d'armes du roi Jean* . . . dont les colonnes dessinent le mouvement plus qu'elles ne le disent, allongées comme l'alerte chevauchée qu'elles reproduisent" (p. 77). "Il a le temps d'évoquer un tapis d'Ispahan, d'en faire une véritable tapisserie verbale" (p. 88).

These examples are chosen at random; they could easily be multiplied. Method, one notices, has been replaced by recipe. Nothing more is needed than some connection, usually quite ingenious, between the sense of the poem and its sound, or look, or effect: Mr. Glauser is imaginative, but not fastidious. In itself, the idea is stimulating, but should not be used without discretion or justification. If one moment, Hugo's alexandrines "semblent vastes et féconds comme les champs," in the next paragraph other lines "*sont un paysage lépreux*." Is this transition from seeming to being acceptable? How does Mr. Glauser manage it? What does he mean? Such sleight-of-hand must be rejected, if language is to preserve its integrity. Participation and representation are not identical experiences. A painted tree is not a tree, the word "woman" is not a woman. There is a difference between a window's clear pane, which allows the gaze to apprehend whatever

lies outside, and stained glass, which uses daylight from without to illuminate its storied sections, further than which the eye cannot travel. Mr. Glauser is not aware of this difference. His remarks on poetic mimicry dwindle into absurdity and stultifying explanations, of which the following is a last triumphant sample (the italics are again mine): "Un vers lui suffira pour nous placer dans ce mouvement de vie qui se trouve autant dans le serpent que dans le héros le plus noble. *C'est pourquoi* les sifflantes qui reproduisent le sifflement du serpent lui serviront également dans l'évocation des tendres mousses" (p. 109).

However mimetic language may indeed be in its origin and operation (and the example of *tic-tac* and *tactique* is a classic, though not conclusive, counter to the theory), however complex the relationships in which poetry may involve us and by which it may affect us, one rule seems clear enough: a poem is recorded, more or less adequately, by memory as it is read or heard, and any word or group of words, with the meanings attached thereto, may be recalled by repetition, in a new and proximate word or group of words, of similar sonorities. This is constantly being accomplished in poetry through rhyme, alliteration, and assonance. These means may be varied and subtle, the basic principle of association is quite simple. Poetry raises enough problems as it is; there is no need to conjure up spurious ones, and offer bogus solutions. Mr. Glauser is a siren brought to grief by her own song. His sensitivity and talent are unquestionable; he should learn to discipline them. His essay, at any rate, does manage to present in actual operation the mimetic processes it so industriously emphasizes: if purity is achieved at the expense of meaning, *Hugo et la poésie pure* often seems a step towards pure criticism.

Bryn Mawr College

MARIO MAURIN

Richard M. Chadbourne, *Ernest Renan as an Essayist* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1957. xxii + 264 pp. \$4.50). SOME sixty years after his death, Renan remains very much of a legendary figure. His name evokes the scandal unleashed in the 1860's by the publication of *La Vie de Jésus*, an outstanding best seller, as well as that new type of wisdom known as *dilettantism* which flourished in the early days of the Third Republic, giving a once austere scholar great popularity in his old age. Though this image of Renan is not to be

discarded entirely, it holds more myth than reality and gives us a most erroneous picture. An historian of early Christianity, Renan was also a moralist deeply concerned with contemporary problems; a philosopher fond of juggling with contrasting ideas, he was also a fervent idealist who stuck throughout his life to his fundamental beliefs. "Un tissu de contradictions" as he once called himself, Renan is not a man whose portrait can be delineated by a few skillful strokes, nor can any legend account for his complex personality.

Professor Chadbourne's book, which received the MLA Crofts-Cornell award in 1956, corrects the traditional portrait of Renan that had been handed down to us with few amendments. It gives new life to the man who, much more than Baudelaire or Rimbaud, was the dominant figure in French letters around the turn of the century. Although this study deals with Renan as an essayist, it actually scans most of his literary production. Moreover if we keep in mind that Renan did not owe his supremacy in the literary world to the twelve volumes on the origins of Christianity, or his profound influence on Anatole France and Barrès, on Benda, Alain, Péguy and many others to the famous *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse* (though they endeared him to a great many readers,) we will realize the true significance of the essays and will place them at the forefront of Renan's writings.

Renan's essays, dealing with a wide variety of topics—religious, philosophical, political, moral, literary—were published in volume form after being first printed in periodicals. Professor Chadbourne demonstrates very convincingly the organic unity of each of Renan's volumes. These volumes are not to be looked upon as collections of articles gathered at random so as to make up a book. The spirit underlying the *Essais de morale et de critique* differs markedly from that of the *Etudes d'histoire religieuse* or the *Mélanges d'histoire et de voyages*. Professor Chadbourne has in fact succeeded in bringing out both the intrinsic originality of each volume of essays and its peculiar stylistic features. Form and contents are indeed closely related in Renan's essays. The evolution that one may find in his thinking is always plainly paralleled in his style. After reading the excellent analyses of a few selections of Renan (they are reprinted in an Appendix,) one cannot but conclude that most critics have erred in their remarks on Renan's style. Ignoring the greater part of his work, they have been prone to identify the *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse* (written in the years 1876-1882 and autobiographical) with Renanian prose. Their comments on Renan's warm, artistic, somewhat effemi-

nate style have no relation whatsoever with the virility, the forceful tone dominant in works as different as the early essays published in the *Liberté de penser*, the *Réforme intellectuelle et morale* (1869-1871) or most of the *Essais de morale et de critique* (1851-1859).

The chapter on Renan's philosophical essays, with its highly original analysis of *renanisme* (interpreted as a protective armor against disillusionment,) is especially enlightening. One may feel however that Renan's religiosity did not deserve such severe treatment, in spite of Renan's failure to achieve an effective compromise between spiritualism and positivism. His wavering, his constant hedging, his evasiveness on metaphysical questions, are indeed open to criticism. His argumentation is often cloudy and the vagueness of his language reflects the vagueness of his thought. Yet Renan is fully aware of the nebulous quality of his thinking. "*Le vague est le vrai*," this is an axiom with Renan, and there lies his answer to those who would denounce the "mist-covered verbal ground" (p. 163) on which he dwells.

Renan's political essays are analyzed in terms of the social and political background of the period, especially in the light of Renan's disillusionment after 1848 and his anxiety in 1870-71. His sympathy for the Revolution of 1848, his passionate plea for the monarchy in the years 1869-1871, his final acceptance of the Third Republic later on, account for the statement that Renan "had, certainly, great facility in adjusting to different regimes" (p. 138). This is true, but the question is worthy of further scrutiny, especially as the contradictions prevalent in Renan's political thinking can be quite revealing. It is usually possible to trace them to two fundamental traits of Renan's personality: a deep-seated pragmatism and the belief that morality is far more important than politics. This approach is the key to Renan's often conflicting views on history and politics. He is less interested in the political hue of a regime than in the stability it has achieved and the spirit that pervades it. The title of Renan's most important political essay, *La Réforme intellectuelle et morale* echoes the lines he wrote in one of his earlier essays: "*La révolution réellement efficace, celle qui donnera la forme à l'avenir, ne sera pas une révolution politique, ce sera une révolution religieuse et morale.*"

This deeply moral nature of Renan stands out clearly in Professor Chadbourne's study. It makes of Renan the essayist a rare combination of scholar and moralist. This together with Renan's skill at practicing "the art of humanizing knowledge" (p. 51) and the artistic value of his prose, account for the enduring readability of his

essays, even when their historical research may be outdated or their current interest a bit stale.

One may wrangle with Professor Chadbourne over minor points: there is little discussion in his book of the impact of German thought on Renan, the marked influence of the *Journées de Juin*—a preview of the Commune—is overlooked (the trend of events between 1848 and 1851 is mentioned in general terms only,) the important essay "Qu'est-ce qu'une Nation?" is referred to in a one line comment, the only writers singled out in a discussion of the French essay after Renan's time are Gourmont, Alain and Valéry—no mention of Péguy, Suarès, Benda or the Gide of *Prétextes*. But these small flaws hold little weight against the overall excellence of the book. Even though it concentrates on Renan's essays rather than on his complete works, this study provides the best book in English on Renan (it is far more original and penetrating than L. F. Mott's volume, published in 1921.) As to the critical bibliography (to which I personally would add the thoughtful essay of Guéhenno, recently collected in his *Aventures de l'esprit*,) it is first-rate.

Bryn Mawr College

MICHEL GUGGENHEIM

John Andrew Frey, *Motif Symbolism in the Disciples of Mallarmé* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Univ. Press, 1957. xix + 158 pp. The Catholic Univ. of America Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, LV. \$2.00). L'AUTEUR le marque lui-même, il n'y a pas, à proprement parler, de disciples de Mallarmé, même si l'on songe à Ghil ou à Valéry. Les "disciples" en question sont simplement des poètes qui écrivaient à la fin du XIXe siècle et chez lesquels une influence mallarméenne est décelable. Sont surtout cités Rodenbach, Kahn, Régnier, Fontainas, Louÿs, Ghil, Royère.

Ce n'est pas n'importe quel genre d'influence que M. Frey s'est proposé de dégager. Il cherchait chez de tels poètes des illustrations de ce qu'il appelle, à la suite de S. Johansen, "symbole-motif," soit un type de composition qui aurait été, sinon créé, du moins développé par Mallarmé. De ce point de vue, la moisson est maigre, comme le reconnaît M. Frey avec une honnêteté qui caractérise tout son livre.

Mais qu'est donc ce "symbole-motif"? L'auteur n'en donne pas de définition, ou description, bien distincte. Ce qui ressort de son étude, c'est que la composition "en motif" ne serait pas simplement

un procédé de composition parmi d'autres, mais la manière de composer la plus proprement poétique, celle qui accomplirait au mieux l'interpénétration des images, celle qui permettrait de conférer au poème l'unité la plus intrinsèque.

Qu'il reste pourtant des équivoques, c'est ce que suggèrent des sous-titres tels que "motif de l'absence," "motif de la conquête et de la domination." Il semble bien qu'on ait affaire ici à ce que, sous le nom de symbole-thème, l'auteur avait opposé dans son introduction au symbole-motif. Si le symbole-motif est proprement poétique, alors il n'est pas motif *de* ceci ou cela. Aussi bien il me semble que cette appellation de "symbole-motif" est si équivoque qu'il vaudrait mieux l'éviter.

Si Mallarmé peut passer pour le poète qui a recherché l'intégrité verbale la plus serrée et la plus complexe, sinon toujours la plus pure (il y a souvent chez lui un fâcheux côté "devinette"), c'est d'abord parce qu'il a voulu plus qu'aucun autre substituer la chose verbale à la chose non verbale, le "livre" au "hasard." Si, de plus, dans certains de ses poèmes, la chose verbale apparaît particulièrement refermée sur elle-même, c'est que le "thème" fondamental est la poésie elle-même, non plus le poète inspiré ou prophète, mais le statut et le surgissement de la chose verbale: Le poème renvoie à lui-même et l'on a une composition en abîme. Si enfin les poèmes caractéristiques de Mallarmé donnent une plus forte impression d'unité que ceux de tel autre poète, n'est-ce pas parce qu'on y trouve une unité qui n'est pas seulement musicale et atmosphérique, mais qui est aussi et surtout intellectuelle? Il me semble que c'est une intuition intellectuelle contraignante, et non une imagination libérée de la pensée, comme le suggère M. Frey, qui peut conférer au poème l'unité la plus "parménidienne." L'exemple de Mallarmé d'une part, et à l'opposé l'exemple des surréalistes, le montrent assez.

M. Frey me semble ici avoir trop fait confiance à l'opposition traditionnelle entre raison, ou pensée, et imagination. Il écrit: "Lorsque Svend Johansen souligne le primat de l'image sur la pensée, il fait la distinction essentielle qui est nécessaire pour juger la poésie symboliste." Dans ce cas Mallarmé serait un bien pauvre poète. En fait ce primat est plus caractéristique des poèmes, ou plutôt des exercices, surréalistes, que de la poésie et de l'esthétique symbolistes en général. Ce n'est guère que dans certains textes de Rimbaud qu'on pourrait reconnaître cette primauté, à condition de ne pas trop prendre à la lettre la thèse de Gengoux. Aussi bien la descendance de Rimbaud

se trouve chez les surréalistes et non chez les poètes dits symbolistes qui, en gros, illustrent plutôt une conception atmosphérique de la poésie. L'état d'âme est un paysage: La sensibilité est reine, non l'imagination. Et chez Mallarmé, ce qui dirige et unit, ce n'est pas non plus l'imagination, mais cette fois l'intellect.

C'est que, par "pensée," M. Frey semble entendre cette pensée quotidienne qui nous fait organiser le donné spatio-temporel selon l'utilité. Cela apparaît lorsqu'il place une composition discursive, descriptive, narrative, sous le signe de la pensée. Mais n'est-il pas abusif d'orienter l'application du mot "pensée" ou du mot "raison" vers ces réflexes quotidiens? A ce prix, les philosophes, les philosophes-poètes comme Héraclite et les poètes-philosophes comme Mallarmé, ne seraient pas penseurs. D'autre part, la constitution banale des phénomènes en choses peut être dite, à la suite de Kant, relever de l'imagination comme de l'intellect. Nous percevons les phénomènes, mais imaginons les choses.

Il conviendrait donc de se dégager de l'hypnotisme de ce mot "imagination" que les romantiques choisirent pour blason en opposition à une "raison" classique ou post-classique, qui n'était pas la raison cartésienne, mais les conventions de Boileau ou la raison utilitaire de Voltaire. Ce que la poésie moderne a tenté, c'est de se dégager de la raison-imagination quotidienne ou conventionnelle, c'est de constituer la chose verbale sans calquer la composition routinière de la chose non verbale. La libération peut rester négative comme dans le cas de la descendance surréaliste de Rimbaud. Alors en effet c'est l'imagination qui se libère surtout, mais elle se libère de l'imagination routinière, elle se libère d'elle-même. La libération peut aussi mener à quelque chose de plus positif, à l'établissement de la chose verbale dans son unité. Ce pourra être l'unité musicale et atmosphérique du poème verlainien et de la plupart des poèmes "symbolistes"; et ce pourra être l'unité du poème mallarméen, du moins de certains, qui est également et surtout intellectuelle. Le préjugé de M. Frey contre le mot "pensée" me semble l'avoir empêché de déterminer ce qui faisait l'originalité de ce type.

Cette prise de position terminologique ne me fait pas oublier la valeur propre au livre de M. Frey. L'auteur manifeste un sens très sûr du poétique, ses jugements de valeur me paraissent justes et ses commentaires sur les poèmes examinés, poèmes peu ou point analysés jusqu'à présent, pénétrants.

Indiana University

ROBERT CHAMPIGNY

Eberhard Kranzmayer, *Historische Lautgeographie des gesamtbairischen Dialektraumes* (Vienna: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1956. xiv + 143 pp. 31 maps).

EBERHARD Kranzmayer is both a descriptive and an historical linguist. For decades he and his co-workers have gathered material from informants in all parts of the Bavarian dialect area. He does not indicate what his methods were, but the results show them to have been thorough. The material is lexical and phonological, apparently not syntactic. The lexical findings are to be published in a "gesamtbairisches Dialektwörterbuch," which, Kranzmayer states, will soon be ready for printing. Such of the phonological information as applies only to individual words will be included there. The present work, which is meant to be an integral part of the dictionary, takes up the sound system in general.

Kranzmayer is interested not only in describing and systematizing what he finds, but also in tracing and explaining development. His point of departure is MHG for the vowels and Late OHG for the consonants. In an overall treatment of so complex a linguistic area, some single point of reference is necessary, even if for no other reason than that of arrangement. The phoneme which was /a/ in MHG, and has in general given [a] or [a:] in NHG, appears in Bavarian dialects as [a, a:, ɒ, ɔ, ɔ:, ʊ, u:, ɔ̃, ũ, ũ, õ] and so forth. Many of these are independent phonemes. Tracing the development of the modern reflexes provides historical explanations for those interested. At the same time the evidence of the modern dialects is repeatedly used to throw light on earlier sound phenomena. Kranzmayer's work is almost as important for the student of MHG as for the student of modern dialects.

One does not necessarily agree with all the historical explanations. I am unable to accept with enthusiasm the theory that earlier Bavarian strove to give all words the same rhythmic value, and for this reason lengthened monosyllabic and shortened trisyllabic words. The idea seems to accredit a certain teleological intelligence to language. Akin to this is what one may call the pathetic fallacy in linguistic development. [d] had to become [t] in the eighth century in order to avoid the danger of falling together with the new [d] < [p] (27 a 6). When final vowels were lost in the twelfth century, old monosyllabic singulars had to lengthen their vowels in order not to fall together with newly monosyllabic plurals, so that the old contrast *viß* vs. *vißße* was replaced by that of *viß* vs. *viß* (34 k 2). MHG *ô* and *â* threatened to fall together as [ɔ̃] (11, 11 a 2), but some dialects successfully

resisted (11 b 2). Similarly one is disturbed to find certain sounds designated "normal" as opposed to other, presumably abnormal, sounds (49 a).

My most serious objection to Kranzmayer's work centers on his phonetic transcription. It would be convenient if all phoneticians used the same system in so far as possible, but one cannot demand that. In principle, any symbol may be used for any sound; but one does have the right to demand a) that the symbol be clearly explained and consistently used, and b) that each symbol represent one sound and each sound be represented by one symbol. Any lack of such clarity and consistency detracts from the usefulness of the representation, and I feel this lack frequently in Kranzmayer. The same symbols (\bar{o} , \bar{u}) are used for central unrounded ("mittelgaumig") and for front rounded vowels, with the note (23 a, N. 4) that the former sound is usually specifically indicated where intended. In 6 a 1 we learn that only Zimbrian has retained the old rounded vowels, and might understand that $\bar{o} = [\text{y}]$ in Zimbrian but a central unrounded vowel elsewhere. In 5 d 2, however, we read that old *-ol-* has changed "zu gerundetem *-öl-*" in some Upper Bavarian dialects, while 49 c 7 tells us that elsewhere *-el-*, *-el-*, and *-il-* have changed "zu den gerundeten Monophthongen \bar{e} , \bar{o} und \bar{u} ." Occasionally (e. g. 5 b 1) it is indicated that the central vowel is intended, but such indication is rare. We are dealing with two distinct if acoustically similar series of sounds, and the reader is often at a loss to know which is intended.

The distinction between lenis and fortis consonants plays an important role in most Bavarian dialects. The same symbols are used for voiced and voiceless lenes, namely *b*, *d*, *g*; and again a note promises us that the presence of voice is always particularly marked. In general the sounds are voiceless, but in 27 e and 27 g 1.6 we are told that conservative South Bavarian dialects maintain the older voiced pronunciation. Only in 27 g 6 is voice indicated by a special device (\bar{d} , \bar{g}). Again one wishes separate symbols had been used consistently for separate sounds.

What is the quality of the reduced vowel in unaccented syllables in the various dialects? This is the one vowel to which no discussion is devoted. Kranzmayer used the symbols *a*, *v*, and *e*. Is *e* = [e] in *wegane*, *rehte* (2 d 1), in *sperren*, *derren* (2 j), et passim? That is perfectly conceivable, but I know that it is not the case in the Alemanic form *nümme* quoted in 26 b 4 (pronounce [$'\text{nym}:\text{ə}$]), and do not think it was so in the MHG pronunciation of *hemede* given 26 b 3 as *hemæde*.

The symbols *i* and *u* for [ɪ, ʊ] are seldom used. Are *i* and *u* always [i, u]? What is the phonetic value of *gg* in 37, described as used to reproduce the "unbehauchten, lautgleichen *k*-" of neighboring languages? How does *gg* differ from voiceless *g* and from *k*? The symbol *n̄m* for a velarized nasal (23 a 4) is confusing. Is the actual sound in *hyn̄mt* [ŋ] or perhaps one involving contact of tongue with both hard and soft plate? The term "Velarisierung" certainly does not indicate presence of [m]. If *z̄* is "stimmhaft und zwischen *s* and *š* zu sprechen," (3 m 2, N. 20), why not say "zwischen *z* and *ž*?" Or is there some difference between *s* and *z* other than that of voice?

Historische Lautgeographie contains a vast amount of valuable material. Its true usefulness cannot well be measured until it can assume its intended function of supplementing the dictionary. The structural approach to parallel sounds is helpful, as are also the maps. It is, in short, a good enough book that one would like to see it better.

University of Illinois

FRANK G. BANTA

Franz Koch, *Idee und Wirklichkeit*, 2 vols. (Düsseldorf: Ehlermann, 1956. Vol. I 327 pp. Vol. II 467 pp.). DER Autor hat sich im Vorwort ausdrücklich als Lehrer bekannt und wendet sich an den Studenten, der einen systematischen Bildungsunterbau braucht, ehe die Wege weiter führen können. Ohne Wissen kein Reifen—ein heute kaum populärer, aber gesunder Standpunkt. Eine solche Zielsetzung verlangt notwendigerweise die Beschränkung auf das Anschauliche der normsetzenden Dichtergestalten. Die Sichtung des Materials ist mit Sorgfalt und Überblick getan und auch mit Überzeugung, wenn auch Überzeugungen nicht jedermanns Sache sind. In der Begrenzung des Stoffes, die für den Leser rascher zur Durchsichtigkeit führt, in den Inhaltsangaben der Dichtungen und ihren Quellen, in den immer wieder eingeflochtenen Daten aus dem Lebensgang der Dichter spricht der Lehrer, in den Richtlinien des Buches der Forscher. Und sie sollen hier im Grossen angedeutet werden.

Wir Alten, die wir ja ungläubige Leser von Literaturgeschichten geworden sind, brauchen uns in diesem Buche nicht mehr mit den schönen Überschriften—Biedermeier, Junges Deutschland, spiritueller, romantisch-phantastischer Realismus—auseinandersetzen. Der Autor gibt nicht vor, dass wir von jedem Einzelnen so ganz genau wissen, in welches Schubfach er gehört. Franz Koch lehnt zwar eine Regrenzung auf das Zeitlos-Gültige des Kunstwerks, wie es die Litera-

turwissenschaft verfolgt, ab, und verbleibt bewusst im Rahmen geistesgeschichtlicher Methoden, er bemüht sich aber um eine andre Profilierung der Epochen. Er gibt die verwirrende Fülle der Termini auf und versucht das literarische Geschehen zwischen Romantik und Naturalismus als Kräftespiel zwischen Dämon und Tyche der Nation zu fassen.

Was steht an Stelle der Schultermini? Spannungskräfte, wie sie schon im Titel des Buches angedeutet sind. Der Autor setzt die Gegensatzreihen naiv und sentimentalisch, objektiv und interessant, weltbildnerisch und selbstbildnerisch fort und operiert mit der seelischen Doppelheit des deutschen Wesens. In ihrem Vorhandensein und in ihrem Miteinandersein sieht er die notwendige Voraussetzung für geistesgeschichtliche Ablauferscheinungen. Daraus ergibt sich eine Literaturgeschichte, die in ihren ausschlaggebenden Wendungen nicht von aussen sondern von innen her bedingt ist.

Franz Koch setzt in der Darstellung der neuen Wirklichkeit des 19. Jahrhunderts bei der Geschichtslosigkeit des Liberalismus ein, der den Entwicklungsgedanken der Aufklärung übernommen und zur freischwebenden Fortschrittsidee weitergebildet hat. Er erörtert die Fragen der sozialen Verschiebungen, des politischen Handelns, die Aufspaltung in eine konservative unpolitische Welt und in eine demokratisch radikalisierte, wofür Börne, Heine und das Junge Deutschland als ideologische Führer herangezogen werden.

Aus dem Nebeneinander des idealistischen Erbes und der neuen Forderungen sieht Koch Spannungskräfte entstehen, die in Übergängen vom Alten zum Neuen oder im Durchbruch zu neuen Ordnungen ihr Gleichgewicht zu gewinnen suchen. Daraus ergeben sich für die Gliederung des Stoffes überindividuelle Einheiten—Wesensformen des Verhaltens,—die an den grossen Schlüsselfiguren, denen Einzelkapitel gewidmet sind, ersichtlich gemacht werden. Immermann, Lenau, Sealsfield, jeder in seiner Art Teilhaber an Idee und Wirklichkeit und doch auch wieder Mensch zwischen Idee und Wirklichkeit, sind die Mittlerfiguren im Umbruch des Jahrhunderts. Droste, Gotthelf, Stifter diejenigen, in denen der Durchbruch zu einem neuen Menschenbild aus dem Glauben an "ein gottgewolltes Gefüge" bereits erfolgt ist. Im Rahmen dieser Richtlinien ist der Geschichtsdichtung von Alexis bis Dahn und der Mundartdichtung in der Nachfolge J. P. Hebels mehr Raum gewidmet als gewöhnlich.

Mit zum Interessantesten des Buches gehört der Versuch, die Münchner Dichtergruppe, in der eine Rückwendung von der Wirklich-

keit zur Idee aufscheint, tiefer in den Zusammenhang einzubauen. Der Strom des literarischen Geschehens, wie er in Übergängen und Durchbruch dargestellt wird, staut sich in diesem Zwischenspiel von Schönheit und Form. Das Bekenntnis zur Idee erscheint inmitten einer anders gearteten Wirklichkeit "heil" erhalten. R. Hamerling wird an die Münchner herangerückt und damit aus seiner Isolierung herausgeholt. Mit C. F. Meyer, in dem zum Schönen das Sittliche tritt, sind die Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten dieser Gruppe bis ins Letzte ausgeweitet. Damit ist die Aufwertung einer scheinbar abwegigen Gruppe durchgeführt, deren Epigontum Koch als Verbindung zwischen Platen und Stefan George sieht.

Während der erste Band mehr auf der Lyrik fusst, wendet sich der zweite den Fragen des inneren Gleichgewichts im Drama zu, das sich in R. Wagner erschöpft. Der Hauptakzent liegt auf F. Grillparzer, der in seinen geschichtlichen Dramen über Hebbel hinaus zu den menschlich bedeutungsvollsten Lösungen gelangt. Und so wie Grillparzer aus seiner alten österreichischen Ecke herausgeholt ist, wird auf dem Boden der Komödie F. Raimund in seine Rechte eingesetzt. Damit ist der Österreicher tiefer in den deutschen Entwicklungsablauf eingebaut.

Die Höchstleistung des Bürgertums liegt im Roman und in der Novelle. Die sorgfältige Darstellung des Schrifttums von Keller, Storm und Raabe zeigt diese Dichter bereits ausserhalb der idealistischen Bildungstradition. In ihnen ist der Umschwung zur neuen Wirklichkeit schon vollzogen. Das Buch schliesst mit einem liebevollen Kapitel über Th. Fontane, "dem Europäer unter den Realisten," der nicht nur über ein anderes Menschenbild, sondern auch schon über eine neue Sprache verfügt, womit er über seine Vorgänger hinaus in die kommenden Zeiten hineinreicht.


Gleichgültig, ob wir die Meinung des Autors teilen über die Kräfte, die er am Werke sieht, über ihre Vorzeichen und Wertigkeit, verdanken wir dem Buch, dass die literarischen Gestalten wieder in den Strom des Werdens gestellt sind, dass ihre Menschlichkeit und Geistigkeit neu benannt werden will, dass ihr Werk neuerdings erwogen und gewogen worden ist. Die Dichter kommen sozusagen ohne fixen Ladenpreis in den Handel und wollen vom Leser neu erworben werden.

Die Brauchbarkeit des Buches wird erhöht durch ein Namenverzeichnis und durch eine Bibliographie, die den wesentlichen Bestand der neueren Forschung feststellt und damit die Wege zur Vertiefung und Urteilsbildung wesentlich erleichtert.

Wellesley

MARIANNE THALMANN





The Call of Blood in French Classical Tragedy

By Clifton C. Cherpach

The "call of blood" is the instinctive reaction by which people are supposed to recognize their kinship to others. It was a significant feature of French tragedy in the 17th and 18th centuries and has never before been singled out or analyzed. Because of the originality of the critical interpretations it contains, and its importance to the whole subject of French classicism, this book will arouse considerable interest. The author, who teaches romance languages at Johns Hopkins, provides new ideas on French classicism in general and on many of the individual dramas of the period.

Table of Contents

- I. The Problem of the *cri du sang*
- II. Instinct for Its Own Sake
- III. Corneille and the Tragedy of Uncertainty
- IV. The Gamut of the *cri du sang* in the Seventeenth Century
- V. The *cri du sang* in Crébillon and Voltaire
- VI. Blood and Instinct to the End of the Eighteenth Century

Index

144 pages

\$3.50 Paper

The Johns Hopkins Press

Baltimore 18, Maryland



GRADED SPANISH READERS

Castillo, Bond, and others

Las plumas del caburé

Edited by CARLOS CASTILLO and LUIS LEAL

This latest addition to the alternate series was written by Blasco Ibáñez. It is a simple and dramatic story of two native sons of Argentina and their blind faith in the miraculous powers of a bird of prey, the caburé.

BOOK

9

ALTERNATE

Book Nine follows the same tested principles as the previous readers—low vocabulary density, careful word repetition, consistent grading. Almost no changes have been made in the original text. The number of new words introduced is 172 and the number of idioms 51. There are the customary brief exercises and complete end vocabulary.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: Englewood, N. J.
Dallas 1

Chicago 16

San Francisco 5

Atlanta 3

Home Office: Boston 16

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

Modern Language Notes: regularly \$6.00 } **BOTH**
ELH regularly \$4.00 } **for**
\$8.00

To receive both journals at a saving of \$2.00, simply send us your order with remittance of \$8.00.

Note: This offer limited to individual subscribers; not available to libraries and other institutions.



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND